HISTORY of DOGMAS

TIXERONT

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/historyofdogmas0003unse

St. Albert's College Library

St. Albert's College Library

HISTORY OF DOGMAS

BY

J. TIXERONT

TRANSLATED FROM THE FIFTH FRENCH EDITION

BY

H. L. B.

VOL. III

THE END OF THE PATRISTIC AGE

(430—800)

Property of
COSA
Please return to
Graduate Theological
Union Library

SECOND EDITION

B. HERDER BOOK CO.

17 SOUTH BROADWAY, ST. LOUIS, MO.

AND

33 QUEEN SQ., LONDON, W. C.

1926

NIHIL OBSTAT

Sti. Ludovici, die 16, Jan. 1916

F. G. Holweck,
Censor Librorum

IMPRIMATUR

Sti. Ludovici, die 16, Jan. 1916

†*Joannes J. Glennon,*
Archiepiscopus
Sti. Ludovici

Copyright, 1916,
by
Joseph Gummersbach,

All Rights Reserved
Printed in U. S. A.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

GENERAL SKETCH OF GREEK THEOLOGY FROM THE FIFTH TO THE SEVENTH CENTURY

PAGE

1. Schools and Scholars 1
2. Scripture, Tradition and the Church, Philosophy 6

CHAPTER II

NESTORIANISM. DEFINITION OF THE UNITY OF THE PERSON IN JESUS CHRIST

1. Christology of the Antiochene School at the End of the Fourth and the beginning of the Fifth Century. Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia 10
2. The Teaching of Nestorius 21
3. Nestorianism up to the Council of Ephesus 34
4. The Council of Ephesus and the Formula of Union (A.D. 433) 43
5. The End of Nestorianism 51
6. The Christology of St. Cyril 58

CHAPTER III

EUTYCHIANISM. DEFINITION OF THE DUALITY OF NATURES IN JESUS CHRIST

1. Eutychianism up to the Latrocinium of Ephesus 76
2. The Council of Chalcedon 84
3. Theodoret's Christology 94

CHAPTER IV

MONOPHYSITE OPPOSITION TO THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON UP TO THE END OF THE SIXTH CENTURY

1. Chief Dates and Events 99
2. Doctrinal evolution of Monophysitism. Eutychian Monophysitism 106
3. Severian Monophysitism 111

CHAPTER V

EFFORTS MADE TO FUSE THE DECISIONS OF EPHESUS AND CHALCEDON

1. The case of the Scythian Monks 124

2139

CONTENTS

PAGE

2. The dispute of the *Three Chapters* till the Fifth General Council 127
3. The Fifth General Council 135
4. The Christology of Leontius of Byzantium 145

CHAPTER VI

MONOTHELITISM. DEFINITION OF THE DUALITY OF WILLS AND OPERATIONS IN CHRIST

1. The Beginnings of Monothelitism to the publication of the Ecthesis 153
2. The Dyothelite reaction up to the Lateran Council of the year 649 169
3. The Sixth General Council 173
4. The Christology of St. Maximus 180

CHAPTER VII

GREEK THEOLOGY FROM THE FIFTH TO THE SEVENTH CENTURY, ON OTHER SUBJECTS THAN CHRISTOLOGY

1. God and the Trinity 185
2. Angelology 194
3. Man. The Fall. Grace 198
4. Soteriology 207
5. Ecclesiology 212
6. The Sacraments. Baptism. Confirmation 219
7. The Eucharist 226
8. Penance 243
9. Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, Matrimony 250
10. Honors paid to the Saints, and Secondary Devotions . . . 255
11. Eschatology 259

CHAPTER VIII

SEMI-PELAGIANISM AND THE DEFINITIONS OF THE SECOND COUNCIL OF ORANGE

1. The Semi-Pelagian Doctrine. Cassian 264
2. St. Prosper's Opposition 272
3. Faustus and St. Fulgentius 282
4. St. Cæsarius and the Second Council of Orange 293

CHAPTER IX

LATIN THEOLOGY FROM THE DEATH OF ST. AUGUSTINE (430) TO THE BEGINNING OF CHARLEMAGNE'S REIGN (771)

1. Historical and Patristic Survey 302

CONTENTS

PAGE

2. The Sources of Faith. Scripture. Tradition. Philosophy . 313
3. God and the Trinity 323
4. The Angels 328
5. Man. Grace. Merit 332
6. Christology and Soteriology 335
7. Ecclesiology 348
8. The Sacraments. Baptism. Confirmation 354
9. The Eucharist 362
10. Penance 374
11. Extreme Unction. Holy Orders. Matrimony 400
12. Mariology. Honors paid to the Saints. Christian Practices . 408
13. Eschatology 412

CHAPTER X

THE IMAGE CONTROVERSY

1. Use and Veneration of Images from the First to the Fifth Century 421
2. Use and Veneration of Images During the Sixth and Seventh Centuries 431
3. The Iconoclast Heresy under Leo the Isaurian (726–740). Opposition of St. John Damascene 439
4. Constantine Copronymus and the Council of Hieria . . . 448
5. First Restoration of Images. The Seventh General Council . 451
6. Iconoclast Reaction, Followed by the Final Triumph of Orthodoxy 454
7. The Image Controversy in the West 458

CHAPTER XI

THEOLOGY OF ST. JOHN DAMASCENE

1. Sources of faith. The Trinity 468
2. Angelology and Anthropology 475
3. Christology and Soteriology 479
4. The Church and the Sacraments 489
5. Worship and Devotions. Eschatology 493

CHAPTER XII

LATIN THEOLOGY IN THE AGE OF CHARLEMAGNE

1. Theologians 497
2. Trinitarian Controversy. The *Filioque* 501
3. Christological Controversy. Spanish Adoptianism 509

CONTENTS

PAGE

4. The Sacraments 523
Conclusion 530
List of works quoted 536
Index 539

HISTORY OF DOGMAS
THE END OF THE PATRISTIC AGE

CHAPTER I

GENERAL SURVEY OF GREEK THEOLOGY FROM THE FIFTH TO THE SEVENTH CENTURY

§ 1. Schools and Scholars.

We have already noted, in the preceding volume, the divergent tendencies that existed, chiefly on the subject of Christology, in the schools of Antioch and Alexandria. Apollinarianism had been the first manifestation of this disagreement. In the course of the 5th century, these divergencies increased and, when pushed to the extreme, gave rise to two great heresies,— Nestorianism and Eutychianism. Whilst the former, which was promptly checked and forced to take refuge in Persia, did not greatly disturb the Church's tranquillity, the latter, which became firmly rooted in the very heart of the Eastern empire and predominant in entire provinces, stubbornly resisted ecclesiastical decisions as well as imperial decrees. As it was subtle in its formulas and ever ready to reappear under some new name, the authorities had to take it into account, and more than once dealt with it, cautiously, because of its strong organization.

Of these struggles the Greek Church was, as it were, the battle-field, and Greek theologians were the leading combatants. However, sometimes at the request of the disputants, at other times of her own accord, the Latin, and especially the Roman Church intervened quite often, in most cases by authoritative decisions rather than by controversial treatises. On the questions in debate Rome and the West had their minds already made up and their terminology nearly settled. They deemed these solutions sufficient and they disliked the mania of arguing and the restless curiosity of the Greeks. This is why we place under the heading of Greek theology whatever pertains to the Christological controversies from the 5th to the 7th century. Still, it is but fair to observe that Greek theologians were not so entirely engrossed by these struggles as not to effect considerable progress in other directions. Of this we shall give a brief outline later on.

The two names that come first to mind, as representing the school of Alexandria and that of Antioch during the 5th century, are naturally those of St. Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret. St. Cyril,[1] bishop from the year 412 to the year 444, is, besides Origen, the strongest theologian of the Greek Church, and with the exception of St. Athanasius the teacher whose authority was most frequently appealed to and most decisive in defining the orthodox teaching. As St. Athanasius is the defender of the doctrine of the consubstantiality, Cyril is the champion of Christ's unity,

[1] Writings in *P. G.*, LXVIII–LXXVII. A detailed list of the writings quoted here is given at the end of this volume.— Works: E. Weigl, *Die Heilslehre des hl. Cyrill von Alexandrien*, Mainz, 1905. J. Mahé, *L'eucharistie d'après saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie*, in the *Revue d'hist. ecclés.*, VIII (1907). Id., *La sanctification d'après saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie*, *ibid.*, X (1909). A. Struckmann, *Die Eucharistielehre des hl. Cyrill v. Alexandrien*, Paderborn, 1910. The literature on St. Cyril's Christological teaching will be mentioned later on, Chapt. II, § 6.

which he pushes as far as compatible with orthodoxy. His opponents criticised his language, and the Monophysites misinterpreted it; but the orthodox councils, though they did not fully endorse, endeavored to explain and justify it.

Opposed to St. Cyril stood Theodoret (bishop in the year 423, + about 458).[2] Of a personality more charming, more exact and elegant as a writer, and more accurate as an interpreter than his opponent, he is his inferior in intuition and theological depth. He, too,— in a direction opposed to St. Cyril's — went to the extreme limit of orthodoxy; perhaps he overstepped this limit, though he came back in time. But he was not treated as indulgently by the later councils, and this fact, in the eyes of superficial observers, may throw some discredit upon his good name. Should we not rather believe that divine Providence raised him, both to counterbalance the excessive enthusiasm of his opponents and to check the heretical tendencies of his own friends?

Theodoret has suffered in the eyes of posterity, chiefly from his association with certain disreputable individuals who influenced him more or less. At the school of Antioch, Theodore of Mopsuestia was his teacher and Nestorius his fellow-student; he remained loyal to Nestorius to the end of his life, and made up his mind to part company with him only after being expressly enjoined to do so by the Council of Chalcedon. Others who stood by his side, fighting against Cyril, were: Paul of Emesa and Andrew of

[2] Writings in *P. G.*, LXXX–LXXXIV. Detailed list of the writings quoted here at the end of this volume.— Works: NEWMAN, *Historical Sketches*, vol. II, London, 1899, pp. 303–362. N. GLUBOKOWSKI, *The Blessed Theodoret* (in Russian), Moscow, 1890. J. SCHULTE, *Theodoret von Cyrus als Apologet*, Wien, 1904. Special works on Theodoret's Christological teaching will be mentioned later on, Chapt. III, § 3.

Samosata, who remained orthodox; such heretics as Alexander of Hierapolis and Eutherius of Tyana, and finally Ibas, who was destined to become bishop of Edessa (consecrated 435, d. 457), and who was condemned with him by the 5th General Council.

The names of Theodoret and St. Cyril close the list of the great scholars of the Greek Church. The literary vein is exhausted, and there begins an era in which theology gains in subtlety what it loses in eloquence. Apart from the Pseudo-Areopagite, whose works appeared about 500, and St. Ephrem of Antioch (527–544), whose writings have almost completely perished,[3] the 6th century produced a real theologian in the monk Leontius of Byzantium (+ about 543),[4] the most determined opponent of Severus of Antioch, the adviser and teacher of Justinian, and who has rightly been called the first of the Scholastics, because he was one of the earliest Church writers who introduced into his works both the rigor and the suppleness of accurate dialectics. A deep thinker as well as an erudite scholar, his purpose is to show the essential agreement between the decisions of Ephesus and those of Chalcedon. The Council of 553 sanctioned most of his views, but did not succeed in preventing the revival of Monophysitism under the name of Monothelitism in the 7th century. This heresy was vigorously opposed by two able writers, St Sophronius of Jerusalem (+638)[5] and especially St. Maximus Confessor (+662).[6] These two, with Anastasius Sinaita (+ shortly

[3] The remnants in *P. G.*, LXXXVI, 2.

[4] Writings in *P. G.*, LXXXVI, 1, 2. For a list of his authentic writings and of works referring to him, see Chapt. V, § 4, *infra*.

[5] Writings in *P. G.*, LXXXVII, 3. Concerning his dogmatic teaching, see H. Straubinger, in *Der Katholik*, 1907, I.

[6] Writings in *P. G.*, XC, XCI and IV. More about him, *infra*, Chapt. VI, § 4.

after 700)[7] and St. John Damascene, are the most distinguished representatives of later Greek theology.

All this theological literature of the East from the 5th to the 7th century, is devoted to Christology. The only exception is the Pseudo-Areopagite,[8] whose attitude on the questions in dispute was so uncertain that the Monophysites appealed to it and their orthodox opponents defended it. The interest of his books lies in his attempt to introduce into the explanation of Christian belief the Neo-Platonic teachings and methods, including those of Proclus, and to develop mystical theology in close harmony with ecclesiastical theology, of which it seems to be, in his system, but a more refined and noble interpretation. His work is marked by exceptional boldness and vigor and, in spite of obscurities and puerilities, has largely influenced the theoretical development of Christian mystics. St. Maximus commented upon it, and the mediæval Schoolmen, who never doubted that the Areopagite had composed the writings bearing his name, quoted them and held them almost in as much respect as the sacred books themselves, and it is not the least interesting result of the *pia fraus* which had first attributed these writings to a disciple of St. Paul, that through them Neo-Platonism obtained a place by the side of Aristotle's speculations in treatises of Scholastic theology.[9]

[7] Works in *P. G.*, LXXXIX.

[8] Writings in *P. G.*, III, IV.— Works: J. Stiglmayr, *Das Aufkommen der pseudodionysischen Schriften*, Feldkirch, 1895. O. Siebert, *Die Metaphysik und Ethik des Pseudo-Dionysius Areop.*, Jena, 1894. H. Koch, *Pseudo-Dionysius Areop. in seinen Beziehungen zum Neoplatonismus und Mysterienwesen*, Mainz, 1900. H. Meertz, *Die Gotteslehre des Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita*, Bonn, 1908.

[9] Besides the authors mentioned in the text (and they are the most important) these others are referred to especially in the VIIth Chapter of this volume: St. Nilus († about 430, *P. G.*, LXXIX); St. Isidore of Pelusium († about 440, *P. G.*, LXXVIII); Theodotus of Ancyra († about 445, *P. G.*, LXXVII); Proclus of Constantinople († 446, *P. G.*, LXV); Basil of Seleucia († about 459, *P. G.*, LXXXV); Eutychius

§ 2. Scripture, Tradition and the Church, Philosophy.

During the period we are studying, Holy Writ preserved the rank assigned to it by Christian antiquity among the sources of theology. It continued to be looked upon as inspired, as the work of the Holy Ghost, who made use of the sacred writers as His instruments, so to speak, in order to make known His teachings.[10] Hence it cannot err, and we are sure to find in it the source of salvation and true doctrine, the infallible oracle whose authority is infinitely greater than that of human reason.[11] As we have already seen, the school of Alexandria and that of Antioch did not interpret the Bible in the same way. St. Cyril, while he follows the historical and literal sense especially in his dogmatic works, adopts with marked complacency, whenever he can do so, the *θεωρία πνευματική*, an allegorical and mystic interpretation which preserves the letter, but draws from it higher teachings.[12] Theodoret, on the other hand, though he admits the beneficial results of that mystic method, sticks more closely to the historical sense and pays greater attention to the human element in the sacred books.[13] Moreover, theologians continued to use compilations of biblical texts, gotten up with reference to the existing controversies, and these formed the basis of all the disputations. We have a notable instance of this in St. Cyril's *De recta fide ad reginas,* I, which contains no less than fifty-seven columns

of Constantinople († 582, *P. G.*, LXXXVI, 2); St. John Climacus († about 600, *P. G.*, LXXXVIII).

[10] Cyril, *In Isaiam*, l. III, t. II, c. 29, v. 11, 12 (col. 656); Theodoret, *In psalm.*, praef. (col. 861); *In Daniel.*, praef. (col. 1257).

[11] Cyril, *De recta fide ad reg.*, II, 1; Theodoret, *Graecar. affect. curatio,* sermo IV (col. 924).

[12] *In Isaiam,* l. I, or. IV, c. 7, v. 1 (col. 192).

[13] *In Galat.*, IV, 21 sqq. (col. 489); *Graecar. affect. cur.*, sermo VIII (col. 1008).

of texts, arrayed against the Nestorians;[14] and in St. Maximus' far less extensive *Dispute* with Pyrrhus.[15]

However, the novelty introduced by the writers of the 5th century, as regards the sources of theology, consists chiefly in a clearer conception of the argument from tradition, strictly so called, and of its value. During the 4th century frequent appeal had been made, not only to sacred Scripture, but also to oral traditions transmitted to the Church by the Apostles, and which drew their authority from their respective sources. Subsequently, some authors — St. Athanasius, St. Basil, St. Augustine — appealed in support of their views to the authority of previous doctors,— Origen, Dionysius, St. Ambrose and St. Gregory of Nazianzus. Beginning with St. Cyril, this form of argument expanded considerably. Not only is appeal made to the mind of the Fathers in general (ἡ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων σύνεσις),[16] but the theory of this proof is set forth: The Holy Ghost speaks through the Fathers;[17] the Fathers teach us ὀρθῶς τε καὶ ἀπλανῶς, and constitute an uninterrupted succession of teachers, in whose ranks St. Cyril, as a bishop, does not hesitate to place himself.[18] This is the argument from the authority of the Church dispersed, speaking through the voice of her pastors.

Hence, just as we find compilations of biblical texts, so we also find compilations of patristic texts, made in view of controversies to be carried on and councils to be held. These collections, adapted to general use, pass from one writer to another and receive constant additions.[19] St. Cyril him-

[14] *P. G.*, LXXVI, 1221–1336.

[15] *P. G.*, XCI, 320–328.

[16] Cyril, *In Ioannis evang.*, IX (col. 216); Theodoret, *Epist.* CLI (col. 1440), CXLV (col. 1384).

[17] Cyril, *Adv. Nestor.*, IV, 2 (col. 176): λαλοῦντος ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος.

[18] Cyril, *In psalm.* XLII, v. 13 (col. 1068).

[19] See on this point J. Turmel, *Histoire de la théologie positive*, I,

self had compiled a collection of this kind, which was read at the first session of the Council of Ephesus.[20] The Oriental bishops had compiled another, of which they could not make immediate use, but which was partly incorporated into Theodoret's *Eranistes*. This last mentioned work embodies three such collections against the Monophysites.[21] There is another in a work directed against the same heretics, ascribed to Leontius of Byzantium.[22] The Monothelite controversy gave rise to other works of the same kind. According to Sergius, the Patriarch Mennas in his letter to Vigilius had already marshaled a certain number of texts in support of the doctrine of one will in Christ.[23] We know that the Patriarch Macarius brought before the 6th general Council — in its 5th and 6th sessions — three such collections.[24] The orthodox party did not allow themselves to be outstripped by their opponents; St. Maximus[25] and the legates at the Council of 680[26] brought forward several compilations of patristic texts in favor of Dyothelitism. From all these facts it can readily be inferred that after the 5th century great importance was attached to the argument from the Fathers in their capacity of doctors and organs of ecclesiastical tradition.

As to philosophy, we may say that its influence was on the increase from the 5th to the 7th century, and that the use made of it in theology became more frequent in proportion as the subjects in dispute called for more subtle analysis and more precise reasoning. Theodoret showed but little

p. 210 sqq., and L. Saltet, *Les sources de l'Eranistes de Théodoret*, in the *Revue d'hist. ecclés.*, VI (1905).

[20] Mansi, *Coll. concil.*, IV, 1183; cf. *De recta fide ad regin.*, I, 9, 10.

[21] *P. G.*, LXXXIII, 73–104; 169–217; 284–317.

[22] *Contra monophysitas* (*P. G.*, LXXXVI, 2, col. 1817–1864).

[23] Mansi, XI, 532.

[24] Mansi, 316 sqq.

[25] *Opuscula theologica* (*P. G.*, XCI, 160–169).

[26] In the 10th session, Mansi, 388 sqq.

respect for the ancient philosophers as a whole.[27] St. Cyril had more esteem for them and, in his refutation of Julian, invoked the authority of Plato, Pythagoras, and Plotinus.[28] Philosophy plays a very important part in the writings of Leontius of Byzantium, in fact, it is this feature which constitutes their novelty. The same tendency also crops out in the works of St. Maximus.[29] However, the philosophy of these writers is no longer so markedly that of Plato or Pythagoras. Towards the end of the 5th century there is at work, among theologians, a movement which tends gradually to combine Aristotle with Plato, and eventually to replace the latter by the former. This evolution owes its impetus to the need of a more rigorous method of dialectics. In spite of all, however, though more and more relinquished and opposed, the Platonic system, in the shape of Neo-Platonism, holds undisputed sway in the works of the Pseudo-Areopagite, and through them finds its way into the commentaries of St. Maximus, thenceforth to remain the philosophy of mystical and contemplative theology, which, in the words of Pseudo-Dionysius, does not prove the truth, but exhibits it symbolically and enables those who yearn for light and holiness[30] to attain to it without going through a process of reasoning.

[27] *Græc. affect. curatio,* I, V, col. 792, 793, 951; *De providentia,* I, col. 557, 560.

[28] *C. Iulianum,* I, VIII, col. 548, 917 sqq. Cf., however, V, col. 773 sqq.

[29] Cf. the *Sermo* XVII of the *Loci communes* (*P. G.,* XCI, 817 sqq.)

[30] *Epist.* IX, 1.

CHAPTER II

NESTORIANISM. DEFINITION OF THE UNITY OF PERSON IN JESUS CHRIST

§ 1. Christology of the Antiochene School at the End of the Fourth and the Beginning of the Fifth Century. Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia.

We have already had occasion to recall the opposite tendencies of the schools of Antioch and Alexandria on the subject of Christology. Whilst the latter placed in the foreground the divinity of the Incarnate Word and the intimate unity of His person, the former endeavored to distinguish carefully the two natures in the God-man and preferred to dwell on His human life. Apollinaris had pushed the Alexandrian tendency so far as to fall into heresy. His condemnation was unanimous, but his system, at least in part, was susceptible of correction. This the Eutychians attempted to do. In the school of Antioch, on the other hand, there arose, about the end of the 4th and the beginning of the 5th century, some representatives of Apollinaris' teaching who exaggerated its bearings and neglected to apply the proper corrections. History has grouped the names of these writers around that of Nestorius.

We have now to set forth these two movements of thought, beginning with that which is connected with Nestorius. However, as is evident from what has just been said, the reader must not forget that, properly speaking, neither Nestorius nor Eutyches originated the heresies for which they are held responsible. These heresies existed before them, and are merely the expression of tendencies

in their respective schools, which were pushed to extremes.

The early school of Antioch, founded by St. Lucian martyr (+ 312), had been replaced, about the middle of the 4th century, by another, founded by Diodore. During the struggle with Arianism and Apollinarianism, Diodore,[1] who was an Antiochian by birth, had strenuously upheld by pen and word the cause of orthodoxy. Raised A. D. 378, through the offices of Meletius, to the see of Tarsus, he enjoyed during his lifetime an exceptional reputation, as a just reward for his learning and virtue. However, after his death (between 386 and 394), and beginning with the 5th century, his fame waned. St. Cyril of Alexandria realized that the source of Nestorianism was to be sought beyond the writings of Nestorius, and he thought he had found it in those of Diodore. Indeed he was not slow in denouncing them;[2] but in spite of all his efforts, he did not succeed in having them condemned, and it is not likely that Diodore was ever anathematized by others than the Monophysites.[3] Nevertheless, these attacks discredited the memory of the Bishop of Tarsus even among Catholics, and cer-

[1] Sources: The remains of his writings in *P. G.*, XXXIII, 1559 sqq.; Marius Mercator (*P. L.*, XLVIII, 1146–1148); Photius, *Biblioth.*, cod. 223 (*P. G.*, CIII, 829–877); P. de Lagarde, *Analecta syriaca*, pp. 91–100. Harnack ascribes to him also the *Confutatio dogmatum Aristotelis* of Pseudo-Justin, the *Quaestiones et responsiones ad orthodoxos*, the *Quaestiones christianorum ad Gentiles*, the *Quaestiones gentilium ad christianos* (Otto, *Corpus apologet.*, vol. IV, V). It is hardly probable that he wrote these works.— Works: V. Ermoni, *Diodore de Tarse et son rôle doctrinal*, in *Le Muséon*, 1901, pp. 424–444.

[2] *Epist.* XLV, LXVII, LXIX, LXXI (col. 229, 336, 340, 344). Besides St. Cyril composed against Diodore and Theodore of Mopsuestia a special work of which only a few fragments have been preserved (*P. G.*, 1437 sqq.).

[3] Photius affirms (*Biblioth.*, cod. 18) that the 5th General Council put Diodore under the ban; but there is no trace whatever of such a condemnation in the acts of that assembly. Photius may have ascribed to the Council of Constantinople, A. D. 553, what was really the work

tainly this is the most plausible way of accounting for the almost complete disparition of his many writings.

Was St. Cyril right in pointing to Diodore as a forerunner of Nestorius? Undoubtedly so; for we find in the remaining fragments of Diodore's writings, especially in his treatises against the Synousiasts, the formulas later on used by the Patriarch of Constantinople and condemned by the Church. In his eagerness to maintain the integrity of the two natures in Jesus Christ against the Apollinarianists, Diodore emphasized the distinction between the Son of God and the son of David whom the former assumed and in whom He dwelt: *τέλειος πρὸ αἰώνων ὁ υἱὸς τέλειον τὸν ἐκ Δαβὶδ ἀνείληφεν, υἱὸς θεοῦ υἱὸν Δαβίδ* (col. 1559). Hence it is only through a figure of speech (*καταχρηστικῶς*) and because the son of David was the tabernacle of the Logos, that we may say of the Logos, the Son of God, that He is the son of David. The Logos is not the son of David; He is His Lord (*ibid.*); He is not the son of Mary: *μὴ τῆς Μαρίας υἱὸς ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος ὑποπτευέσθω* (col. 1560). For the Word had not two births, one from all eternity, and the other in time; but, being born of the Father, He made unto Himself a temple of him who was born of Mary (col. 1561). Therefore the man born of Mary is the Son of God, not by nature, but by grace; the Word alone is so by nature (*χάριτι καὶ οὐ φύσει . . . χάριτι υἱὸς ὁ ἐκ Μαρίας ἄνθρωπος, φύσει δὲ ὁ θεὸς Λόγος*, col. 1560). This was tantamount to teaching that there were two distinct sons in Jesus Christ. However, Diodore repudiates this conclusion under the pretext that what he teaches, is not that there were in the Saviour two sons of David, or two sons of God *κατ' οὐσίαν*, but only that God's eternal Word dwelt in him who is David's offspring: *Τὸν πρὸ αἰώνων θεὸν Λόγον λέγων κατωκηκέναι ἐν τῷ ἐκ σπέρματος*

of a (Monophysite) Council of Constantinople held in 499 (Victor of Tunnunum, *Chronicle, P. L.*, LXVIII, 949).

Δαβίδ (col. 1559). Nay, he probably maintained, at least in words, the unity of person (col. 1561 A), and certainly looked upon the man in Jesus as worthy of adoration together with the Word. But, notwithstanding his endeavor thus to preserve and justify the current language, it is quite evident that several of his assertions cannot be accepted and that, while he attempts to emphasize the inconfusion of the two natures in Christ, he unduly separates and isolates them.

As has been said already, there remain but a few fragments of Diodore's writings; of the works of his disciple, Theodore (bishop of Mopsuestia in 392, + in 428), there also remain, besides two exegetical commentaries, only some dogmatic fragments, which are, however, sufficiently extensive to afford matter for a complete doctrinal exposition.[4] Like Diodore, Theodore during his lifetime enjoyed a fine reputation as a writer and an exegete. For the Nestorians he has remained "the interpreter." Unfortunately, like his master's, nay still more so, his reputation has suffered considerably from the Christological struggles in which his name became mixed up. The Fifth General Council condemned both his person and his writings, and he is generally regarded as the true Nestorius, *i.e.*, the theoretical exponent of the heresy to which the Patriarch of Constantinople gave his name. Let us see how far this is true.

In keeping with the tradition of the Antiochian theologians, Theodore dwells particularly on the human side of

[4] The remains of Theodore's writings are gathered in *P. G.*, LXVI. H. B. Swete has edited the commentary on St. Paul's Epistles and given a more complete edition of the dogmatic fragments: *Theodori episc. Mops. in epistolas B. Pauli commentarii*, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1880–1882. The second volume contains the dogmatic fragments. In the following pages, the quotations are from Swete's edition with references to Migne's Patrology in parenthesis.

the Redeemer's person. The humanity assumed by the Word is complete (ἄνθρωπος τέλειος), made up of a human body and a rational soul,[5] and so real withal that, as man, Christ grew up and developed like other children, not only in age and physical strength, but also in wisdom and discernment, in fact, in every kind of knowledge.[6] He was tempted, and the temptations that assailed him were not merely exterior; they came from within and gave rise to real interior struggles, which were the condition of His moral progress.[7] He overcame these temptations and never failed in His fidelity to God, since He could not sin because of His virginal birth and union with the Word.[8]

This union was both the result of grace and a reward of the anticipated merits of Jesus *qua* man, whilst His merits partly resulted from His union with the Word, and partly were the moral and meritorious cause of that union. "Jesus," says Theodore, "had an uncommon inclination for what is best, because of His union with the Word-God, of which He was deemed worthy, according to the foreknowledge of the Word-God, uniting him to Himself

[5] *Expositio symboli,* Swete, 328 (col. 1017).

[6] *De incarnatione,* VII, Swete, 297, 298 (col. 976, 980); *Contra defens. peccati origin.,* cod. 2, lib. 3, Swete, 335 (col. 1009); cf. the work *Adv. incorrupticolas et nestorianos,* III, 32 (*P. G.,* LXXXVI, 1, 1373).

[7] "Plus inquietabatur Dominus et certamen habebat ad animae passiones quam corporis, et meliore animo libidines vincebat, mediante ei deitate ad perfectionem. Unde et Dominus ad haec maxime instituens videtur certamen. . . . Carnem et animam adsumens, per utraque pro utrisque certabat; mortificans quidem in carne peccatum, et mansuetans eius libidines, et facile capiendas meliore ratione animae faciens; erudiens autem animam et exercitans et suas passiones vincere et carnis refrenare libidines." *De incarnat.,* XV, Swete, 311 (col. 991–993). This view of Theodore will hardly surprise us, when we recall that, on the subject of original sin, he shared the error of Julian of Eclanum, who held that Jesus Christ was subject to the concupiscence of the flesh (see the 2d vol. of this *History of Dogmas,* p. 437).

[8] *De incarnatione,* VII, Swete, 296 (col. 977).

from the heights [of heaven]," *κατὰ πρόγνωσιν τοῦ θεοῦ Λόγου ἄνωθεν αὐτὸν ἑνώσαντος ἑαυτῷ.*[9]

In what does this union consist? Theodore gives it various names: *ἕνωσις*, which is rather vague; *συνάφεια*, a term common in the school of Antioch, which signifies *binding, conjunction,* an expression indefinite in itself, and already used by several writers of unquestionable orthodoxy;[10] *σχέσις, relation, reference,* a very vague word, strongly condemned by St. Cyril; *ἐνοίκησις, indwelling,* the Word dwelling in the humanity, as in a tent or temple,—a concept that was also familiar to the theologians of Antioch.

In a very striking passage,[11] Theodore explains this indwelling, not by the presence of God in the Saviour, either in substance or operation, *οὐσίᾳ ἐνεργείᾳ*, but as a special kindness and complacency (*εὐδοκία*) which God, and especially the Logos, took in Jesus. This complacency is of the same nature as that which God takes in all the righteous; with this sole difference that God and the Logos delighted in Jesus *as in a son, ὡς ἐν υἱῷ.* This term proved to be the starting-point of Theodore's whole teaching on the union. He writes as follows:

"What does this mean: *'as in a son'?* It means that, dwelling [in Jesus], the Word has united wholly to Himself the one whom He has assumed, and thus prepared him to share in all the dignity which He, the Son by nature, who dwells [in Jesus], makes common between them. He makes Jesus but one person [with Himself], through the union to which [He raises him]; to him He imparts every primacy. Through him He intends to accomplish all

[9] *Ibid.*

[10] Cf. Petavius, *De Incarnatione,* lib. III, cap. II, n. 7; and the 2d vol. of this *History of Dogmas.*

[11] *De Incarnatione,* VII, Swete, 293–296 (col. 972–976).

things — the judgment, the scrutiny of the whole world, and His own parousia." [12]

Elsewhere Theodore returns to this idea and develops it; he writes thus in his letter to Domnus:

"The union of the two natures, which has benevolence for its principle, effects in them, through the identity of name, the absolute indivisible unity of appellation, will, operation, authority, strength, domination, dignity, and power, there being in them, according to this union, but one sole person." [13]

And a few lines farther down:

"The mode of union *κατ' εὐδοκίαν*, which preserves the natures without confusion and division, shows that the person of both is but one, and one also the will, one the operation, and one, consequently, the authority and domination." [14]

And again:

"As He [Jesus] is higher than all principality, all power, all sovereignty, all virtue, and every name that is named, not only in this age, but in the age to come, He receives adoration from every creature, since He is inseparably united to the divine nature; every creature paying him adoration, because and in consideration of God." [15]

Hence the union of the divine and human natures in

[12] *Ibid.*, SWETE, 296 (col. 976).

[13] *Ἡ κατ' εὐδοκίαν τῶν φύσεων ἕνωσις μίαν ἀμφοτέρων τῷ τῆς ὁμωνυμίας λόγῳ ἐργάζεται τὴν προσηγορίαν, τὴν θέλησιν, τὴν ἐνέργειαν, τὴν αὐθεντίαν, τὴν δυναστείαν, τὴν δεσποτείαν, τὴν ἀξίαν, τὴν ἐξουσίαν, μηδενὶ τρόπῳ διαρουμένην· ἑνὸς ἀμφοτέρων κατ' αὐτὴν προσώπου καὶ γενομένου καὶ λεγομένου.* SWETE, 338 (col. 1012).

[14] *Ὁ δὲ τῆς κατ' εὐδοκίαν ἑνώσεως τρόπος ἀσυγχύτους φυλάττων τὰς φύσεις καὶ ἀδιαιρέτως ἓν ἀμφοτέρων τὸ πρόσωπον δείκνυσιν, καὶ μίαν τὴν θέλησιν, καὶ μίαν τὴν ἐνέργειαν, μετὰ τῆς ἑπομένης τούτοις μιᾶς αὐθεντίας καὶ δεσποτείας.* SWETE, 339 (col. 1013).

[15] *Ἀναφορᾷ θεοῦ καὶ ἐννοίᾳ πάσης αὐτῷ τῆς κτίσεως τὴν προσκύνησιν ἀπονεμούσης.* *Expositio symboli,* SWETE, 329 (col. 1017).

Christ — a union which Theodore declares began with the Saviour's conception [16] and is indissoluble [17] — is such that it makes the human nature share in the divine authority and dignity, and renders it adorable like God and on account of God to whom it is united, far more than it establishes between the two natures a personal unity. One person possesses both natures, *ἑνὸς ἀμφοτέρων . . . προσώπου καὶ γενομένου καὶ λεγομένου.*

This last statement, which Theodore repeats again and again, is of capital importance. "When we distinguish the natures," he writes, "we say that the nature of the Divine Logos is complete, and that His person also is complete, for it cannot be said of a hypostasis that it is impersonal; [18] [likewise we say] that man's nature is complete and his person also is complete. But when we consider the union, we say there is one person only." [19]

There is but one person and consequently but one son and one lord in Jesus Christ: "Rightly we confess but one son, since the distinction of natures must needs be upheld, and the union of the person (*ἡ τοῦ προσώπου ἕνωσις*) inviolably preserved." [20]—"We speak neither of two sons nor of two lords, for there is but one Son by essence, the God-Word, the only Son of the Father, in whose name and dignity of

[16] *Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ διαπλάσει, ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς μήτρας. De incarnat.*, SWETE, 297 (col. 977); *Epist. ad Domnum*, SWETE, 339 (col. 1013); *Contra Apollinar.*, SWETE, 314 (col. 994).

[17] *Expositio symboli*, SWETE, 329 (col. 1017); *Contra Apollinar.*, IV, SWETE, 316 (col. 1000).

[18] *Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπρόσωπον ἔστιν ὑπόστασιν εἰπεῖν.* It is remarkable that the word *ὑπόστασις*, which, when used during the 5th century in connection with the Trinity, was set apart, as it were, to designate the divine Persons, had no longer the precise meaning of person when it was used in other connections. It designates, in this passage, a reality, a concrete nature, and it was used in this sense by Nestorius.

[19] *De incarnatione*, VIII, SWETE, 299, 300 (col. 981); V, SWETE, 292 (col. 969, 970); XI, SWETE, 302 (col. 983, 984).

[20] *De incarnatione*, XII, SWETE, 304, (col. 985).

Son, that [man] shares who is united to Him and participates in His divinity; the Lord by essence is the Word-God, whose divinity is shared by the one who is united to Him. This is why we speak neither of two sons nor of two lords." [21]

Hence, in Jesus Christ, duality of natures, but also personal unity, unity of sonship, lordship, dignity and authority; unity of adorable greatness; this is Theodore's teaching, and it is apparently quite orthodox. However, the reader may have noticed how often, for the purpose of safeguarding the integrity and inconfusion of the two natures in their union, the Bishop of Mopsuestia speaks of these natures as two persons complete in themselves. The human nature is *αὐτός, οὗτος, ὁ λαμβανόμενος*: it is Jesus who fights against temptation and grows in perfection "mediante ei deitate ad perfectionem." [22] It is the man only that is the historical Jesus. Theodore says that the union implies unity of will and action (*μία θέλησις, μία ἐνέργεια*) between the two natures; but he does not employ these expressions in the heretical meaning which the Monothelites gave to them afterwards. The unity referred to by Theodore is merely a moral harmony; the human will conformed to that of the Word, and subordinated its action to His. At times Theodore seems to look upon this agreement of the wills as the true bond that joined the two natures in community of person: *Ὁ τεχθεὶς ἐκ τῆς παρθένου δίχα σπορᾶς ἄνθρωπος οὐ διεκρίθη τοῦ Λόγου, ταυτότητι γνώμης αὐτῷ συνημμένος, καθ' ἣν εὐδοκήσας ἥνωσεν αὐτὸν ἑαυτῷ.*[23] Each nature

[21] *Expositio symboli*, SWETE, 329 (col. 1017); *Ad baptizandos*, SWETE, 323 (col. 1013).

[22] *De Incarnatione*, XV, SWETE, 311 (col. 991–993).

[23] *De Incarnatione*, SWETE, 311. Notice also: *ἐν αὐτῷ (ἀνθρώπῳ) δὲ ὢν (ὁ Λόγος) κατὰ τὴν σχέσιν τῆς γνώμης* (*De incarnat.*, XV, SWETE, 310, col. 992); and again, *ἑνώσας αὐτὸν ἑαυτῷ τῇ σχέσει τῆς γνώμης* (SWETE, 308).

kept its own physical action which must be attributed to it, and which could be attributed only figuratively and through a sort of misnomer to the other nature, taken even *in concreto* and in the union.

We come now to the question of the *communicatio idiomatum*. The way Theodore handles it, is one of the weakest points of his Christology. Like all the Antiochians, the Bishop of Mopsuestia fails to see that the personality of Jesus Christ is in the Word, that the mystery of the Incarnation consists merely in this, that the person of the Word, already possessing the divine nature, joined to itself a human nature, and that to this incarnate Word can and must be ascribed all the actions and passions of His humanity. Theodore does not realize this; hence he regards as Apollinarian, and therefore erroneous, both the formulas that ascribe human actions and passions to the incarnate Word, and those which ascribe divine attributes to the concrete man in Jesus Christ. All the fragmentary remains of his work against Apollinaris could be quoted here. Thus, it is folly to say that God was born of a virgin: "Est quidem dementia Deum ex virgine natum esse dicere . . . Natus autem est ex virgine qui ex substantia virginis constat, non Deus Verbum ex Maria natus est. Natus autem est ex Maria qui ex semine est David. Non Deus Verbum ex muliere natus est, sed natus ex muliere qui virtute sancti Spiritus plasmatus est in ea." [24] But in that case can Mary be called θεοτόκος? Yes, though not in the strict sense: "When we are asked if Mary is ἀνθρωποτόκος or θεοτόκος, we answer that for us she is both: ἀνθρωποτόκος, by the nature of the fact; θεοτόκος, by relation (ἀναφορᾷ). Ἀνθρωποτόκος by nature, since the one whom she bore and who came forth from her womb, was a man; θεοτόκος, because God was in the man whom she brought forth, not through a

[24] *Contra Apollinarium*, III, SWETE, 313, 314 (col. 993, 994, 998).

limitation of His nature in him, but through a relation of His will (*κατὰ τὴν σχέσιν τῆς γνώμης*)." [25] Lastly, is the man in Jesus God's natural son? No. "It is through grace (*χάριτι*) that Jesus shared in the sonship; He was not born of the Father by nature, but enjoyed this, the greatest of all privileges, that He acquired the sonship through His union with the Word, and by this union received a fuller communication of that divine sonship." [26] Again: "It is through a special favor He has received the sonship, since the divinity alone possesses the sonship by nature," *χάριτι προσείληφεν τὴν υἱότητα, τῆς θεότητος μόνης τὴν φυσικὴν υἱότητα κεκτημένης*.[27] Now, in spite of what he says to the contrary, these statements of Theodore show evidently that he believes in two sons in Jesus Christ, just as in two lords. While there is only one sonship and one lordship, essential in the Word, adoptive and participated in Jesus, there are two subjects of that lordship and sonship.

There is, then, a radical defect in the Christological doctrine as taught by Theodore at Antioch and Mopsuestia at the end of the 4th and in the first quarter of the 5th century. True, he preserves the traditional formulas and tries to account for them satisfactorily. But the fundamental affirmation of Jesus Christ's personal unity is not sufficiently insisted upon and developed. Theodore fails to realize its true meaning and all that it implies.[28] Carried away by his eagerness to avoid Apollinarianism, he does not see the partial truth contained in that heresy nor the great im-

[25] *De Incarnatione*, XV, Swete, 310 (col. 992).

[26] *De Incarnatione*, XII, Swete, 306 (col. 988).

[27] *Ibid.*, Swete, 303 (col. 985; cf. 984).

[28] In the *Contra Apollinarium*, IV (Swete, 318, 319, col. 999, 1000), Theodore compares the union of the two natures to that of the body with the soul; but in the *De Incarnatione*, VIII (Swete, 299, col. 981), he compares it to the union between man and woman, of which it is said they are not *duo, sed una caro*.

portance, from a soteriological point of view, of joining intimately, in Jesus Christ, the human nature to the Word, and proclaiming a God-man who suffered and died. Nay, Theodore does not even draw the logical consequences from those truths which he formally admits. Moreover, he employs many inaccurate expressions and defends certain propositions that are heterodox at least in their obvious meaning. Keeping all this in view, the reader will not be at a loss to understand why the Bishop of Mopsuestia was condemned by a council whose leading spirits were theologians of the Cyrillian school; this condemnation he assuredly deserved, if only for the false interpretations to which his writings easily lent themselves.

§ 2. The Teaching of Nestorius.

As has already been said, Theodore's teaching was not attacked during his life-time; even the extreme doctrinal tendency of which he was the representative, might have been left unmolested for a time, had it not been for a circumstance which drew public attention to it. In the same year in which Theodore died, on April 10, 428, another Antiochian by training and tendency, the priest Nestorius, was consecrated for the see of Constantinople. He had been chosen by the Emperor for his tried virtue and oratorical ability. He was a trained theologian, well versed in the method of literal exegesis and accustomed to weigh the meaning of biblical texts, as was usual at Antioch.

In the beginning, his attitude was uncompromisingly orthodox.[29] But soon an incident occurred that threw doubt on his orthodoxy. Nestorius had brought with him from Antioch a priest named Anastasius, who was an enthusiastic disciple of Theodore of Mopsuestia. In one of

[29] Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.*, VII, 29.

his sermons to the people, about the end of the year 428, this priest protested against the title θεοτόκος being given to the Blessed Virgin, on the pretext that it implied an absurdity: θεοτόκον τὴν Μαρίαν καλείτω μηδείς. Μαρία γὰρ ἄνθρωπος ἦν· ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπου δὲ θεὸν τεχθῆναι ἀδύνατον. As the expression was both ancient and in common use, the scandal was great. Nestorius sided with Anastasius, and in a series of discourses set forth the doctrine of the Incarnation and the meaning of θεοτόκος, as he understood them.[30] The disturbance increased: the imperial court, on the whole, upheld the Patriarch, while the clergy, monks and people disagreed among themselves, some accepting, others condemning his views. In a sermon preached before Nestorius, the bishop-elect of Cyzicus, Proclus, did not hesitate to contradict him;[31] on the other hand, the bishop of Marcianopolis, Dorotheus, gave his approval.[32] This meant a schism. The Patriarch of Alexandria, who soon became acquainted with the situation, made up his mind to intervene. However, before we relate the vicissitudes of his intervention, it may be profitable briefly to present the teaching of Nestorius.[33]

Like all Antiochians, Nestorius starts with the two natures, the divine and the human, and declares that, after

[30] Socrates, *Hist. eccl.*, VII, 32.

[31] See his discourse in Mansi, IV, 577 sqq.

[32] Cyril, *Epist.*, XI, 3, col. 81.

[33] The sources that enable us to know the doctrine of Nestorius are (1) the remains of his own works, *viz.* (a) the Greek, Latin and Syriac letters, discourses and fragments, gathered by F. Loofs, *Nestoriana*, Halle, 1905; (b) the *Book of Heraclides of Damascus*, extant only in a Syriac translation and edited by P. Bedjan, Paris, 1910; translated into French by F. Nau, Paris, 1910. (Our references are to this translation.) (2) The writings of Church historians and theologians, from St. Cyril to St. John Damascene, and the acts of the councils that dealt with Nestorian Christology.— Works: J. F. Bethune-Baker, *Nestorius and his Teaching*, Cambridge, 1908. L. Fendt, *Die Christologie des Nestorius*, Kempten, 1910.

their union, they remain entire and perfectly distinct. There is between them no mixture and combination (*κρᾶσις, σύγχυσις, permixtio*);[34] Christ is *διπλοῦς τῇ φύσει*: there is in Him *διαίρεσις τῆς θεότητος καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος*.[35] *Χωρίζω τὰς φύσεις*, Nestorius used to say, *ἀλλ' ἑνῶ τὴν προσκύνησιν*.[36] This is his fundamental assertion frequently repeated. Each nature preserves its own properties and acts.[37]

In Christ these two natures are united; there is between them *ἕνωσις, συνάφεια, συνάφεια ἄκρα, ἀκριβής, διηνεκής, coniunctio inseparabilis, summa et inconfusa;*[38] but this union is not *κατ' οὐσίαν* nor *καθ' ὑπόστασιν*.[39] For a union *κατ' οὐσίαν* and *καθ' ὑπόστασιν*,— such as that between body and soul in man,— is necessary and required by the two parts that are united, and results in the unity of *οὐσία* and nature, whilst the union of the two elements in Christ was voluntary; it had for its origin God's good pleasure (*εὐδοκία*) and condescension, and did not interfere with the distinct existence of the two natures.[40] The union of the elements in Christ is a personal union, and it resulted in a unity of person. Nestorius makes that statement over and over. There are two natures in but one person: *τῶν δύο φύσεων μία ἐστὶν αὐθεντία . . . καὶ ἓν πρόσωπον*: there is *μοναδικὸν πρόσωπον, una persona Unigeniti.*[41]

How does Nestorius understand this personal unity?

[34] Loofs, 224, 229, 273, 281, 301.

[35] Loofs, 281.

[36] Loofs, 262.

[37] *Book of Heraclides*, pp. 187, 190, 192, 213, 220.

[38] Loofs, 171, 178, 242, 275, 280, 357, 359.

[39] Like Theodore of Mopsuestia, Nestorius, in his Christology, employs the words *ὑπόστασις* and *φύσις* as synonyms in the meaning of a concrete *οὐσιά* (*Book of Heraclides*, pp. 42, 43, 136, 137, 138, 145).

[40] *Book of Heraclides*, pp. 35, 142–144. The reader will notice, pp. 142, 143, the criticism of St. Cyril's comparison of the hypostatic union with that of body and soul.

[41] Loofs, 171, 176, 196, 224, 280.

Like Theodore, he seems now and then to look upon it merely as a communication of dignity, power, authority and adorable prerogatives, made by the divine nature or the Logos to His humanity. *Τῶν δύο φύσεων μία ἐστὶν αὐθεντία, καὶ μία δύναμις ἤτοι δυναστεία καὶ ἓν πρόσωπον κατὰ μίαν ἀξίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν τιμήν.*— *Αὐτὸς (υἱὸς) ὁ εἷς ἐστι διπλοῦς οὐ τῇ ἀξίᾳ, ἀλλὰ τῇ φύσει.*—*Ἓν γὰρ ἦν ἀμφοτέρων τὸ πρόσωπον ἀξίᾳ καὶ τιμῇ, προσκυνούμενον παρὰ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως.*[42] God and the man in Jesus Christ are worthy of the same worship: *Χωρίζω τὰς φύσεις ἀλλ' ἑνῶ τὴν προσκύνησιν.*[43] Nestorius explains that unity by the identity of action and will, the human action and will having the same objects as the divine action and will: *διὸ καὶ μίαν αὐτῶν (τῶν φύσεων) τὴν θέλησιν ἐνέργειάν τε καὶ δεσποτείαν ὁρῶμεν, ἀξίας ἰσότητι δεικνυμένας*;[44] and again: *Ἓν γὰρ ἦν ἀμφοτέρων τὸ πρόσωπον . . . μηδενὶ τρόπῳ ἢ χρόνῳ ἑτερότητι βουλῆς καὶ θελήματος διαιρούμενον.*[45] Hence a union which is not *κατ' οὐσίαν*, but *κατὰ γνώμην*. However, Nestorius realizes that these explanations are incomplete, and when pressed by his opponents, sets forth more satisfactorily what he means by a personal union. He protests against the charge of keeping one nature apart from the other, and placing between them a mere bond of dignity and love; he declares they are joined in their essence, through a union of which the unity of dignity, honor and power is but a result, a union which holds the middle between fusion and division of the two natures.[46] In virtue of this union there is but one person: "God's only begotten Son, the same indeed, creates and is created, but not from the same point of view. The Son of God, the same indeed, has suffered and has not suffered, but not from the same point of view; one part of these

[42] Loofs, 196, 280, 281, 224.
[43] Loofs, 262, 248, 249.
[44] Loofs, 224.
[45] Loofs, 224; *Book of Heraclides*, pp. 63, 67.
[46] *Book of Heraclides*, p. 167.

things is found in the nature of the divinity, and the other in the nature of the humanity."[47] The Word ἄσαρκος is not distinct from the Word incarnate; it is the same Word both before and after the Incarnation:[48] "Sicut enim deus existens et homo, idem ipse secundum Paulum et novissimus [est] et ante saecula, sicut homo quidem recens, sicut deus autem ante saecula."[49] The Word has appropriated the humanity to Himself, and therefore whatever pertains either to the divinity or to the humanity of Jesus belongs to Him.[50] Nay, each nature makes the properties of the other nature its own, as it were, just as in a burning brand wood and fire co-exist in one and the same subject.[51] Hence we must not distinguish the Word and the man in whom He dwelt numerically, as if they were two distinct beings; Οὐκ ἄλλος ἦν ὁ θεὸς Λόγος καὶ ἄλλος ὁ ἐν ᾧ γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος:[52] there are not two Christs, nor two Sons: οὐδὲ πάλιν ἄλλος υἱὸς καὶ ἄλλος πάλιν: the same one has two natures, but he is one: ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ὁ εἷς ἐστι διπλοῦς, οὐ τῇ ἀξίᾳ ἀλλὰ τῇ φύσει.[53] The Word accomplishes nothing without His humanity.[54]

To this one person, possessing two natures, Nestorius does not give the name of Word, or God, simply, for these names designate the Word ἄσαρκος; but he calls it exclusively by the names Christ, Lord, Son, and even only begotten Son,— names which, in his eyes, apply strictly to the

[47] *Book of Heraclides,* pp. 122, 136, 138, 140. "We speak not of union of *prosôpons,* but of natures. For in the union, there is one *prosôpon* only, but in the natures, two distinct entities. . . . The *prosôpon* (as a matter of fact) is common, one and the same" (*ibid.,* p. 152). See also pp. 52, 204, 206, 209.

[48] *Book of Heraclides,* pp. 44–47, 185, 186.

[49] Loofs, 270.

[50] *Book of Her.,* p. 139.

[51] *Book of Her.,* p. 138.

[52] Loofs, 224; *Book of Her.,* pp. 174, 177, 186, 204, 205, etc.

[53] Loofs, 281; *Book of Her.,* p. 186.

[54] Loofs, 275.

Word incarnate: "When Holy Writ intends to mention Christ's birth from the Blessed Virgin or His death, it does not say *God,* but either *Christ,* or *the Son,* or *the Lord,* because these three appellations can be applied to the two natures, either to one or the other, or to both." [55] They serve to designate the incarnate person, and this is why there can be no question of two Christs, two sons or two lords. "There is a distinction between the divinity and the humanity, but Christ, as such, is undivided; the Son, as such, is undivided; for we have not two Christs nor two Sons; for us, there is not a first Christ, and a second Christ, one Christ and then another, one Son, and another Son: the same one it is who, although being one, is twofold, not in dignity, but in nature." [56]

Thus far, the teaching of Nestorius is correct, and the reader may ask himself in what his error consists. He errs in two things: first, in failing to explain satisfactorily the unity of person in Christ; and second, in failing to draw the necessary consequences from that unity.

Nestorius regards the only personality which he admits in the Word Incarnate, as a result of the union, and not as the personality of the Word itself which seizes the humanity, as it were.[57] Whilst in truth the unity of person in Jesus Christ is based on the fact that the Word, an immutable person, appropriates our nature, which thus becomes necessarily *im*personal, Nestorius attributes it to a union that takes place between the respective personalities of the two natures. For he does not conceive a nature that would exist without its connatural personality.[58]

[55] Loofs, 273, 274, 269.

[56] Loofs, 281; cf. 273, 275, 299, etc.

[57] *Book of Her.,* pp. 127, 128, 129, 144, 186, 190, 218.

[58] *Book of Her.,* pp. 187, 193, 273. In this apology, the word *prosôpon,* which is often used, has not always the precise and strict meaning of *personality* or *person.* At times Nestorius uses it to

Hence the Word and the man bring into the union each his own personality. The natures remain what they were; but the personalities unite so as to form but one, "the *prosôpon* of union," which is the *prosôpon* neither of the Word nor of the man, but of the compound.[59] As a result of this union of personalities, the Word becomes this man Jesus, and this man Jesus becomes the Word "in *prosôpon*," the Word and the man remaining, however, "in their respective natures." "It is in the *prosôpon* the union has taken place, so that the one (the Word) is the other (the man), and this second (the man) is the first (the Word)."[60]

How, according to Nestorius, is this personal unity brought about in Christ? In the *Book of Heraclides* the Patriarch speaks often of a mutual exchange of personalities between the Word and the man, the Word using the *prosôpon* of the humanity, and the humanity using the *prosôpon* of the divinity; and some might believe his purpose is to explain the origin of the unity of which we are speaking, and the bond itself of the Incarnation. "The Incarnation is represented as the mutual use of the two (*prosôpons*) seizing each other and giving each other mutually."[61] Again: "The natures subsist in their *prosôpons* and in their natures, and in the *prosôpon* of the union. As to the natural *prosôpon* of one, the other makes use of it because of the union; thus there is but one *prosôpon* for the two natures. The *prosôpon* of one essence uses the *prosôpon* of the other."[62] But this is not really what he

designate all that is implied in a complete nature, or even the external appearance of the person: "For He [the Word] took on, not the nature, but the form; the man's form and appearance in all that the *prosôpon* implies" (p. 145).

[59] *Book of Her.*, pp. 132, 282, 127, 128, 146.

[60] *Book of Her.*, p. 211.

[61] *Book of Her.*, p. 233.

[62] *Ib.*, p. 194.

means. In the theory of Nestorius, the mutual use of the *prosôpons* does not constitute the personal unity of Jesus Christ, but is merely an effect of the same. It is because Jesus Christ, the God-man, is one person through the *prosôpon* of union, that in Him "the divinity makes use of the *prosôpon* of the humanity, and the humanity of that of the divinity;"[63] which means that Jesus Christ-God (though not ceasing to be man) acts as a man, and Jesus Christ-man (though not ceasing to be God) acts as God. The personal unity of Jesus Christ consists in the act of "taking" and in that of "giving." The person of the Word *takes* unto itself the human person, and by way of compensation, as it were, *gives* itself to that person. Through this taking and giving, the two *prosôpons* interpenetrate each other, and are "one in the other"; they form but one person, the person of Christ, losing their separate being and becoming parts of a whole. However, this personal unity of the whole is not due to any fusion or combination of the divine and human *prosôpons*. Such a fusion or combination is no more necessary than a fusion or combination of body and soul to constitute the one person in man. Hence the *prosôpon* of the Word and that of the man continue to subsist in some way as *prosôpons* subordinate to the *prosôpon* of Christ, of which they are the components.[64] This last *prosôpon* controls them and makes use of them as it does of the two natures; but they also, considered in the whole, make use of each other, just as the soul makes use of the body, and the body

[63] *Ib.*, pp. 212, 213.

[64] It is quite difficult to ascertain exactly what Nestorius thought of the *formal* permanence of the *prosôpon* of the Word and that of the man in the union. Logically these *prosôpons* must disappear, and as a matter of fact, the Patriarch insists on the personal unity of Jesus Christ. But on the other hand, as may be seen from the texts, he speaks of these *prosôpons* as elements that retain each its own existence.

of the soul. They belong to each other and "sustain each other." "There is no condescension," Nestorius writes, "like that by which the *prosôpon* of the man is His [*i.e.* God's], and He Himself gives to man His own *prosôpon.* This is why He [God] made use of his *prosôpon* [the man's], because He took it for Himself." [65] Again: "The only Son of God and the Son of man, the same one who is [made up] of the two, is said to be both, for He has attributed [the properties] of their *prosôpons* to His *prosôpon,* and henceforth either of these two *prosôpons,* as well as His own *prosôpon,* serves to designate Him. He addresses men sometimes through the divinity, sometimes through the humanity, and at other times through both, just as the humanity sometimes spoke by means of the essence of the humanity, and sometimes by means of the *prosôpon* of the divinity." [66] Take, too, the text already quoted: "The natures subsist in their *prosôpons* and in their natures and in the *prosôpon* of the union. As to the natural *prosôpon* of one, the other makes use of it in virtue of the union; thus there is only one *prosôpon* for the two natures. The *prosôpon* of one essence uses the *prosôpon* of the other." [67]

[65] *Book of Her.,* p. 66.

[66] *Book of Her.,* p. 50.

[67] *Ib.,* p. 194.— Here are a few more texts that illustrate this part of Nestorius' system. The reader will notice that they are all taken from the *Book of Heraclides.* The fragmentary remains prior to the Patriarch's exile say nothing of the exchange of *prosôpons,* which is referred to so often in the apology; — an omission which leads us naturally to believe that it was only afterwards Nestorius had recourse to the theory of the exchange of the *prosôpons,* in order to defend himself. "You [Cyril], go against [the Fathers], because you insist that in the two natures, God the Word is the *prosôpon* of union" (p. 127). "It is Christ, then, who is the *prosôpon* of the union, God the Word is not the *prosôpon* of the union, but of His nature, and it is one thing to say it, and another to understand it" (p. 128; cf. p. 146). "This is why Holy Writ speaks so guardedly of the *prosôpon* of the divinity

This concept of the hypostatic union is far from being orthodox. It underrates the function of the Word and tends to make the personal unity of Christ a merely moral

and designates the two [natures] by the *prosôpon* of the union" (p. 232). "It is neither the divinity [alone] nor the humanity [alone] that constitutes the common *prosôpon,* for this *prosôpon* belongs to the two natures, that both may be known in it and through it. . . . The essence of the humanity itself uses the *prosôpon* of the divinity, but not the essence itself, and likewise the essence of the divinity uses the *prosôpon* of the humanity, but not the essence, as you have imagined" (p. 282). "The *prosôpon* of the divinity is the humanity; and the *prosôpon* of the humanity is the divinity; it is not the same in either nature and in the union" (p. 168). "Christ's humanity does not differ in its nature from that of men, but in honor and *prosôpon* . . . not indeed through another honor, but through the honor of Him who has taken the *prosôpon;* the humanity making use of the *prosôpon* of the divinity, and the divinity making use of the *prosôpon* of the humanity" (p. 183). "They take each other's *prosôpon* and not the natures, and this is why they are distinct, whilst [He] has not two *prosôpons*" (p. 195). "The divinity makes use of the *prosôpon* of the humanity, and the humanity of that of the divinity; in this way we affirm one *prosôpon* for the two natures . . . they [the natures] are united without confusion and mutually use each other's *prosôpons*" (pp. 212, 213). "It is through a sort of mutual compensation of taking and giving their respective *prosôpons* that he [Gregory of Nazianzus] speaks of the union of the divinity and the humanity" (p. 232). "The Incarnation is looked upon as the mutual use of the two [*prosôpons*] by taking and giving, but (Holy Writ) calls Him Son, and Christ, and Lord, sometimes because of the *prosôpon* of the divinity, and sometimes on account of the *prosôpon* of the humanity" (p. 233). "They [the natures] carry each other's *prosôpon,* and thus one nature uses the *prosôpon* of the other nature, as if it were its own" (p. 266). "Through the *prosôpons* of the union, one is in the other, and this *one* is not conceived by diminution or suppression or confusion, but by the action of taking and receiving, and by the use of the union of one to the other, both *prosôpons* receiving and giving each other, but not the essences. We consider this one as well as that one, and that one as well as this one, while both remain" (p. 223). "Likewise, there are in Christ two natures, one, of God the Word, and the other, of the man, and a *prosôpon* of the Son, which is made use of by the humanity, and a *prosôpon* [of the] man, which is used also by the divinity. Both [do not make use] of the natures, but of the natural *prosôpon* of the natures. . . . The natures are not without *prosôpons,* nor the *prosôpons* without essence" (pp. 272, 273).

unity. Hence we can readily understand why Nestorius, though maintaining that personal unity in theory and affirming it again and again, speaks too often of the two natures, and especially of the Word and the man, as of two independent persons:

"Alius quidem Deus Verbum est qui erat in templo quod operatus est Spiritus, et aliud templum praeter habitantem Deum." [68]—"Si quis hominem qui de virgine et in virgine creatus est hunc esse dixerit Unigenitum qui ex utero Patris ante luciferum natus est, et non magis propter unitionem ad eum qui est naturaliter Unigenitus Patris, unigeniti appellatione confiteatur eum participem factum; Iesum quoque alterum quempiam praeter Emmanuel dicat, anathema sit." [69]

In these and many other texts that might be quoted, Nestorius evidently forgets what he has already affirmed, *i.e.*, that in Jesus Christ, God and man are but one person. Evidently he does not realize the full bearing of his assertions. He goes so far as to say that "the Word of God was the God of Christ" and that "the same was both the child and the Lord of the child." [70]

Another consequence of his way of conceiving the personal unity of Jesus Christ is that the person of Christ resulting from the Incarnation, is not entirely identical with the person of the Word before the Incarnation.[71] It is for this reason that Nestorius refuses to ascribe to the Word, or to God, in virtue of the *communicatio idiomatum*, the actions and sufferings of the humanity. These must be

[68] Loofs, 340; cf. *Book of Her.*, pp. 55, 61.

[69] Loofs, 214, 331, 334.

[70] Loofs, 291, 292.

[71] "The *prosôpon* is not found in the essence; it is not [for instance] in the essence of God the Word which is not the *prosôpon* of the union of the natures that have united themselves, so as to unite the two essences in one *prosôpon* of God the Word, for it is not both by essence" (*Book of Her.*, p. 146). However, there are other passages (pp. 76, 78) in which Nestorius says that the Word possesses the humanity in its own *prosôpon*.

ascribed to Christ, or to the Son, or to the Lord,— appellations that imply the two natures. Δῆλον δὲ ὅτι τοῦ Δαβὶδ υἱὸς ὁ θεὸς Λόγος οὐκ ἦν.[72] "Non est mortuus incarnatus Deus, sed illum in quo incarnatus est suscitavit."[73] "Go through the whole New Testament, and you will nowhere read that death is attributed to God, but to Christ, or to the Son, or to the Lord."[74]

For the same reason, he does not admit that Mary is θεοτόκος in the strict and natural sense of the word.[75] The mother, he argues, must be of the same nature as her son. Now Mary is a creature; hence she cannot be, properly speaking, the mother of God.[76] The Father alone is absolutely θεοτόκος.[77] "Habet matrem Deus? ἀνέγκλητος Ἕλλην μητέρας θεοῖς ἐπεισάγων."[78] Elizabeth brought forth a child that was filled with the Holy Ghost in its mother's womb: do we therefore call her πνευματόκος?[79] However, since the word θεοτόκος is of frequent use among the faithful, it can be tolerated for the sake of peace, on condition that it be accurately understood and that Mary be called also ἀνθρωποτόκος.[80] Mary "genitrix Dei [est] non propter nudam humanitatis divinitatem, sed propter unitum templo Deum Verbum; ἀνθρωποτόκος vero propter templum quod consubstantiale est naturaliter virgini sanctae."[81] For, in fact, God passed through the Virgin, and came from her (προ-

[72] Loofs, 177.

[73] Loofs, 252.

[74] Loofs, pp. 269, 166, 171, 217, 259, 266. "Where have the Fathers ever said that God the Word was born, according to the flesh, of a woman?" (*Book of Her.*, pp. 131, 132, 133).

[75] *Book of Her.*, p. 173. Nestorius regarded the term θεοτόκος as of heretical (Apollinarian) origin; *Book of Her.*, p. 154.

[76] Loofs, 167.

[77] Loofs, 276.

[78] Loofs, 252.

[79] Loofs, 352.

[80] Loofs, 167, 181, 184, 185, 191, 192, 301, 302, 303, 309, 312, 319.

[81] Loofs, 303, 309.

ελθεῖν), but He was not begotten of her (γεννηθῆναι).[82] The Logos who was begotten from all eternity had no other birth.[83] Personally Nestorius preferred the expression χριστοτόκος, which, since the word Christ indicates the two natures, has the advantage of doing away with any difficulty and of being a biblical expression.[84] He suggests also the expression θεοδόχος, *receptacle of God:* "θεοδόχον dico, non θεοτόκον, δ litteram non κ exprimi volens." [85]

Nestorius, even though he admits that Jesus Christ is only one Son, evidently inclines to refuse to Him, considered as man, the title of the true Son of God. The Word is Son truly and by nature (φύσει καὶ ἀληθῶς); the man is so only through identity of name with the Son (ὁ δὲ ὁμωνύμως τῷ υἱῷ υἱός).[86] The Only-begotten is the Son of God προηγουμένως καὶ καθ' ἑαυτόν: the man assumed by Him is a Son of God only ὁμωνύμως, *i.e.*, because of the Son to whom he is united; [87] hence the 5th anathematism of Nestorius in reply to St. Cyril, who taught that Jesus is Son εἷς καὶ φύσει, reads as follows: "Si quis, post assumptionem hominis naturaliter dei filium unum esse audet dicere, cum sit et Emmanuel, anathema sit." [88]

On the whole, Nestorius followed, though with more discrimination and greater precision in terms, the path blazed by Theodore of Mopsuestia. Paradoxical as it may appear, we venture to say that he is not as much of

[82] Loofs, 277, 278; *Book of Her.*, pp. 261, 262.
[83] Loofs, 176, 177, 252, 285, etc.
[84] Loofs, 177, 181, 182; *Book of Her.*, pp. 91, 92.
[85] Loofs, 276.
[86] Loofs, 217.
[87] Loofs, 217, 218; cf. 274 and *Book of Her.*, p. 164.
[88] Loofs, 214. The text can be interpreted also in the sense that, after the Incarnation, the Son of God has not one nature only, which is true. However, Marius Mercator saw in it the assertion that Jesus, because of His two natures, is both God's natural and His adopted Son (*P. L.*, XLVIII, 916).

a Nestorian as Theodore. He tries to preserve the ecclesiastical terminology, and he seems unquestionably sincere when he asserts the personal unity of Christ. But as he understands that unity superficially and inaccurately, he fails to realize both the consequences of that unity for the whole doctrine of the Incarnation and salvation, and the formulas that must find their way into the theological vocabulary, once this dogma is held. Carried away by his fear of Apollinarianism, he fell into the opposite error, and the overcautious sense of discrimination which he claimed to apply in the exposition of his teaching, so narrowed his mental horizon that he did not see the whole truth he was seeking.

§ 3. Nestorianism up to the Council of Ephesus.

As has been said, the Patriarch of Alexandria soon learned of the scandalous sermon of Anastasius at Constantinople and of the public support the latter had received from Nestorius. The teaching of his colleague could not but distress him. In his pastoral letter of the year 429, published probably on the feast of the Epiphany, he undertook to give a true explanation of the doctrine of the Incarnation.[89] Hearing that the error was spreading among the monks, he wrote his first letter *Ad monachos Ægypti*, which dealt especially with the θεοτόκος, the divinity of Jesus Christ and the mode of union of the divinity and humanity in Him. Whilst he plainly alluded to the events that had taken place at Constantinople, he did not mention Nestorius.

Cyril's letter to the Egyptian monks made Nestorius extremely indignant, and several of his followers attempted to answer it. The duel between the two patriarchs had now begun, and Cyril thought it his duty to act. In two let-

[89] This is the *Homilia* XVII, in *P. G.*, LXXVII, 768 sqq., especially 773 sqq.

ters (the IId and the IVth) he informed Nestorius that his doctrinal innovations were the chief cause of the disturbance in the churches, and begged him to remedy that unfortunate state of affairs by asserting with all Christians the θεοτόκος, and professing the true faith about Jesus Christ. Of this faith the Patriarch of Alexandria gave a luminous exposition. But he received no answer to his first letter, nothing but a mere acknowledgment.[90] In his answer to the second letter Nestorius set forth his own doctrine, discreetly condemned that of his opponent, and ironically advised him to mind his own business, since everything was as it should be at Constantinople.[91] Cyril must have realized that his intervention was useless and most certainly unwelcome. The attitude taken by Nestorius, an Antiochian and successor of St. John Chrysostom, towards him, an Alexandrian and the nephew of Theophilus, could scarcely surprise him.[92] But the practical difficulty was great. To sever communion with Nestorius would not remedy the evil. Besides, Cyril could not think of judging and deposing him only with the help of his Egyptian bishops. Nestorius was the patriarch of the imperial city and had the support of the court, while the Patriarch of Antioch, his former schoolmate, did not favor taking authoritative and rigorous measures

[90] Loofs, 168; *P. G.*, LXXVII, 44, *Epist.* III.

[91] Loofs, 173 and foll.; *P. G.*, LXXVII, 49 and foll.; *Epist.* V.

[92] To understand fully what has been called the "tragedy" of Nestorius, we must take into account, not only the doctrinal divergences, but also the violent antipathy which existed between the two parties. The Alexandrians had been extremely hurt by the decree of the Council of 381, which had deprived the see of St. Athanasius of its prerogative as the first see of the East and transferred it to Constantinople. On the other hand, at Constantinople and Antioch, people recalled the unjust treatment inflicted on St. John Chrysostom by Cyril's uncle, Theophilus of Alexandria. In a word, both parties had humiliations and insults to avenge; these facts contributed to render a dispassionate and amicable discussion of the questions at issue impossible from the very beginning.

against him.[93] There was but one way of solving the difficulty: to deprive Nestorius of the support of Theodosius II and his wife and sister; and, by appealing to Rome, to obtain from the West the moral support necessary to counteract the influence of the court and the Orientals. Owing to that moral support, Athanasius had been able to hold in check the whole army of the Arians, even though they were in possession of the greatest sees; Cyril had recourse to the same tactics, not as a means of self-defense, but of attack.

He probably spent the last months of the year 429 and the first of 430 in writing his two treatises *De recta fide ad Theodosium* and *De recta fide ad reginas libri II;* it was only towards the middle of 430 that he wrote to the Pope.

Rome was already to some extent acquainted with the facts. Soon after his promotion, realizing that he was threatened, Nestorius had written Pope Celestine two letters,[94] in which he asked information about the Pelagians who had taken refuge at Constantinople, and expressed his grief at finding in his episcopal city a certain number of Arians and Apollinarians who misused the word θεοτόκος, as though Mary had brought forth the divinity itself. Now this appellation, although not altogether accurate, might be tolerated, but only in the sense that Mary had begotten the human dwelling which the Word united inseparably to Himself. These letters of Nestorius to the Pope were accompanied by a collection of several commentaries, probably his homilies on the subject of the Incarnation.[95]

[93] *Inter epist. Cyrill., Epist.* XV.

[94] Loofs, 165, 169; *P. L.*, XLVIII, 173, 178. In the second letter, Nestorius mentions that he has already written several times to Celestine in reference to the Pelagians; these letters are no longer extant.

[95] Cyril, *Epist.* XIII, col. 96: τετράδας ἰδίων ἐξηγήσεων. That writings containing the errors of Nestorius are here referred to, is evident from the sequel of Cyril's letter. This is an important point, for it shows that Rome did not judge the teaching of Nestorius merely from the data supplied by his opponent.

These missives were not as well received at Rome as the Patriarch had expected; nay, they alarmed the Holy See. Cyril's letters, which meanwhile reached the Pope, could but strengthen that impression.[96] The documents which Cyril sent to Rome included a letter — the *Epistula XI* — in which, addressing the Pope as a father (*θεοφιλεστάτῳ πατρί*), and recalling that a long-standing ecclesiastical custom made it obligatory for bishops to acquaint the Holy See with important affairs, Cyril set forth the facts referring to Nestorius and asked advice as to the best thing to do. This letter was accompanied by a collection of homilies preached by Nestorius in his church,[97] a short summary of his teaching, a memorandum embodying extracts from Nestorius' writings as well as passages from the Greek Fathers bearing on the question at issue, and, lastly, the letters written by the Patriarch of Alexandria on that occasion, *i.e.*, the IId and IVth letters, and probably also his first letter to the Egyptian monks, which Possidonius was commissioned to hand to the Pope.

No doubt, Celestine thought he was sufficiently informed by all these documents, and, before answering Cyril, held a council at Rome in July or August 430. A short fragment of the Pope's discourse on this occasion has been preserved.[98] Resting his assertions on texts of St. Ambrose, St. Hilary and St. Damasus, Celestine vindicated the doctrine of the *θεοτόκος* and charged Nestorius with heterodoxy. The Council condemned the Patriarch of Constantinople.

Four letters signed by the Pope, under date of August 11, 430,[99] made this sentence known first to Nestorius, then

[96] It was probably a result of that impression that he who later on became Pope Leo I, asked Cassian to write his treatise *De incarnatione Christi.*

[97] Cyril states this expressly, *Epist.* XI, 2.

[98] Mansi, IV, 550.

[99] Mansi, IV, 1025, 1036, 1043, 1017; Jaffé, 372–375.

to the clergy and laity of Constantinople, to the leading bishops of the East and of Macedonia (John of Antioch, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Rufus of Thessalonica, and Flavian of Philippi), and finally to St. Cyril. Nestorius was told that, unless he retracted publicly and in writing within ten days after receiving the papal decision, and preached on the subject of Christ's person in accordance with "what was taught by the Church of Rome, that of Alexandria, and indeed the whole Catholic Church," he should deem himself "cut off from all communion with the Catholic Church." Cyril was commissioned to see that the sentence was properly carried out. In a letter to him the Pope, after praising him for his faith, delegated to him "the authority of his see, to act in his name," and entreated him to proceed with vigor.

This was indeed a heavy blow for Nestorius; he was condemned, and his rival was chosen to humble him. Yet his friends advised him to submit for the sake of peace.[100] Nestorius made a reply, which, though evasive, was quite satisfactory, and declared he would abide by the decision of the general council he had asked the Pope to convoke.[101]

Cyril, on his part, did not remain inactive. Considering the hypothesis that Nestorius might wish to retract, and desiring to prepare a formula that he might sign, he convoked a council of Egyptian bishops at Alexandria, which issued a lengthy synodal letter, the *Epistula XVII*,[102] drawn up by himself, which was sent to Nestorius. It was divided into two parts. In the first, after officially notifying the Patriarch of Constantinople of his condemna-

[100] See the letter of John of Antioch in MANSI, IV, 1061. This letter was gotten up with the help of several bishops, particularly Theodoret (*ibid.*, 1068).

[101] See his third letter to Celestine, LOOFS, 181; it was written before August, 430.

[102] It was written at the beginning of November, 430.

tion, Cyril gave a deep and luminous exposition of the doctrine of the unity of Jesus Christ. In the second, he summed up that exposition in twelve anathematisms, to which Nestorius was asked to subscribe.

These famous anathematisms [103] played such an important part in the history of Nestorianism that we must give a survey of them.

The first asserts the legitimacy of the *θεοτόκος*.

The second teaches that the union of the Word with the flesh was a union *καθ' ὑπόστασιν*.

The third reads: "If anyone shall, after the union, divide the hypostases in the one Christ, joining them by a mere connection of worthiness, authority, and power, and not rather by a physical union, let him be anathema." [104]

The fourth affirms that we cannot attribute to two persons or two hypostases (*προσώποις δυσὶν ἤγουν ὑποστάσεσι*), or separately to the man and the Word in Christ, what Holy Writ or the saints have said of Jesus Christ.

The fifth condemns the use of the term *θεοφόρος ἄνθρωπος* to designate Christ, and proclaims Him the one and true Son by nature, *υἱὸν ἕνα καὶ φύσει*.

The sixth rejects the idea that the Word was the God or Lord of Christ, for the same is both God and man.

The seventh affirms that Jesus Christ, as man, was not moved by the Word, nor clothed with His glory, as though he were a person distinct from the Word.

The eighth rejects the unity of adoration in the Nestorian sense. The man assumed by the Word must not be co-

[103] Regarding them see the article of J. MAHÉ, *Les anathématismes de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie et les évêques orientaux du patriarchat d'Antioche*, in the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, VII (1906), 505 sqq.

[104] *Εἴ τις ἐπὶ τοῦ ἑνὸς Χριστοῦ διαιρεῖ τὰς ὑποστάσεις μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν, μόνῃ συνάπτων αὐτὰς συναφείᾳ τῇ κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν, ἤγουν αὐθεντίᾳ ἢ δυναστείᾳ, καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον συνόδῳ τῇ καθ' ἕνωσιν φυσικὴν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.* (Cf. *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 2d series, vol. XIV, p. 211.)

adored and co-glorified and co-named together with the Word, ὡς ἕτερον ἐν ἑτέρῳ, but adored together with Him, as the unique object of one adoration.

The ninth affirms that the Holy Ghost was not a power foreign to Jesus (ἀλλοτρίᾳ δυνάμει), which enabled Him to perform His miracles; but that He was His own spirit (ἴδιον αὐτοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα) through which the Savior performed His divine works.

The tenth teaches that our Priest and Pontiff is not a man distinct from the Word Incarnate, and that He did not offer the sacrifice for Himself, as He was sinless, but for us.

The eleventh says that the flesh of the Lord was the very own flesh (ἰδία) of the Word, and not of some other person united to the Word merely κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν; and that, consequently, it was vivifying (ζωοποίος), since it was the very flesh of the Word, who imparts life to all.

The last anathematism proclaims that the Word suffered, was crucified, died in His flesh (παθόντα σαρκί, καὶ ἐσταυρωμένον σαρκί, καὶ θανάτου γευσάμενον σαρκί), and became the first-born among the dead, inasmuch as He was God, and therefore the principle of life.

These formulas show great theological acumen, and were framed in such a way as to make evasion on the part of Nestorius impossible. But they are open to two objections: they contain numerous details and precisions which the Pope had not required; and — what is more important — they present the dogma of Christ's personality in distinctly Cyrillian concepts and terms, which, as we shall see later, were not free from imperfection and which Nestorius in particular could not accept. Thus, for instance, the second anathematism affirms that the union between the divinity and the humanity in Christ was καθ' ὑπόστασιν. Now, as has been already remarked, the word ὑπόστασις had not

yet acquired a settled and definite meaning in the language of Christology. Nestorius understood it to mean a concrete substance,[105] whilst Cyril used it sometimes for πρόσωπον, sometimes for φύσις.[106] But it was the expression ἕνωσις φυσική in the third anathematism, that was to be the most regretted. I have translated this expression by "physical union,"— in opposition to moral union. This is the meaning St. Cyril attached to it, as he himself explained; but it was inevitable that prejudiced opponents should explain it in the sense that the divinity and the humanity formed but one nature in Jesus Christ. This, of course, was Apollinarianism, *i.e.*, the very same error which Nestorius and his followers had fought with all their might and the fear of which had carried them to the other extreme.

Naturally, they were unwilling to subscribe to it. Nestorius issued twelve counter-anathematisms,[107] in which he upheld his own teaching and condemned that of his opponent as Apollinarian. John of Antioch, and even those Antiochians who had first advised Nestorius to submit, changed their attitude. Andrew of Samosata, in the name of the bishops of the East,[108] and Theodoret, in his own name, attacked Cyril's anathematisms, especially the third, which seemed to teach only one nature in Jesus Christ.

[105] Cf. above, p. 23, note 39.

[106] Anathem. II, III, IV and elsewhere. Cf. below, p. 58. Cyril claimed that, by this union καθ' ὑπόστασιν, he meant merely to say that the nature or hypostasis of the Word had united itself to the human nature, truly indeed, but without transformation or fusion, κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἑνωθεὶς τροπῆς τινος δίχα καὶ συγχύσεως (*Apologet. pro XII capitulis contra Theodoretum*, col. 401).

[107] Loofs, 211 [*The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 2d series, vol. XIV, p. 206 sqq].

[108] We may recall that, in the 5th century, the word *East* designated especially the *diocese of the East*, viz. that country which corresponded generally to the patriarchate of Antioch. Besides this document, Theodoret wrote also his CLIst letter against the anathematisms.

Cyril answered their criticisms [109] and explained that in the expression ἕνωσις φυσική the word φυσική meant simply *true* and *real:* Εἰ δὲ δὴ λέγοιμεν φυσικὴν τὴν ἕνωσιν, τὴν ἀληθῆ φαμεν . . . Ἕνωσις φυσικὴ, τουτέστιν ἀληθής.[110] However he felt that he ought to justify himself still more completely, and later on published a third *Explicatio duodecim Capitum* [111] with the avowed purpose of warding off the charge of Apollinarianism brought against him.

At the beginning of the year 431, after all these proceedings, the condition of things was just as unsettled as before. Nestorius had not submitted; the Oriental bishops, if they did not approve his doctrinal excesses, upheld his person; so also did the Emperor. There was but one resource left: to hold a general council; and this is precisely what Nestorius had asked the Pope, and the monks of Constantinople had begged the Emperor to do.[112] Cyril himself had asked for it.[113] Theodosius II and his colleague Valentinian III convoked a general council to be held at Ephesus on Pentecost Day, June 7, 431. The Pope sent two bishops, Arcadius and Projectus, to represent the Roman Council, and a priest named Philip to represent himself personally; and demanded that Nestorius, though already condemned, be present at the Council.[114]

[109] *Apologeticus pro XII capitibus contra orientales, Apologeticus pro XII capitulis contra Theodoretum* (*P. G.*, LXXVI, 316, 392).

[110] *P. G.*, LXXVI, 332, 405.

[111] *P. G.*, LXXVI, 293.

[112] Mansi, IV, 1101 sqq., especially 1108.

[113] Evagrius, *Hist. eccles.*, I, 7.

[114] Mansi, IV, 1292. A special invitation had been sent by the Emperor to St. Augustine (Mansi, IV, 1208); but the Saint died (August 28, 430) before the imperial messenger arrived.

§ 4. The Council of Ephesus and the Formula of Union (A. D. 433).

This being a history of dogmas, the reader will not find here a detailed account of the proceedings of the Council of Ephesus.[115] A mere outline will suffice for our purpose. On the appointed day Nestorius was at Ephesus with sixteen bishops, Cyril with fifty, Memnon, bishop of Ephesus, with forty. There were also present twelve Pamphylian bishops, Juvenal of Jerusalem, and Flavian of Philippi, representing Rufus of Thessalonica. The Pope's legates, as well as John of Antioch and the Oriental bishops, had not yet come, and the assembled prelates waited for them fourteen days. Finally, at the request of a certain number of the bishops present, Cyril decided to open the proceedings on June 22.

The legitimacy of this measure has been called in question. Cyril was Nestorius' prosecutor, and Pope Celestine had not commissioned him to preside over the Council. However, taking the evidence as it lies before us, it is difficult to pass a definitive judgment. There is an unexplainable contradiction between the official acts of the Council, drawn up under Cyril's supervision, and the conduct of the Oriental bishops.[116] On June 21, the eve of the opening

[115] See the acts in MANSI, *Coll. concil.*, IV, and the *Synodicon* in MANSI, V, and in the *Bibliotheca cassinensis*, II. Cf. HEFELE-LECLERCQ, *Hist. des Conciles*, II, 1. (*History of Church Councils*, vol. III, chapt. II). L. DUCHESNE, *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*, III. A. LARGENT, *Saint Cyrille et le concile d'Ephèse*, Paris, 1892.

[116] Cyril may have thought he had the right to open the Council, if it is true, as recorded in the acts (MANSI, IV, 1332; cf. 1229) that, before his arrival, John of Antioch had sent two bishops, Alexander of Apamea and Alexander of Hierapolis, to tell Cyril to wait for him no longer and begin work. Cyril must have naturally surmised that John was not particularly anxious to witness the condemnation of Nestorius. But it must be noticed that the two bishops of Apamea and Hierapolis were precisely of the number of those who protested against

day, sixty-eight bishops, Theodoret among them, requested that the proceedings be postponed till the arrival of John of Antioch [117] and on the 22d, Count Candidian protested in the Emperor's name against beginning the deliberations.[118] But these requests and protests were not heeded. A hundred and fifty-nine bishops and the deacon Bessula, representing the Bishop of Carthage, gathered in the church of Mary.[119] Nestorius was three times called, and when he failed to appear, the doctrinal controversy was immediately taken up.

The Council first had the Creed of Nicæa read, then St. Cyril's second letter to Nestorius (*Epist.* IV) and the latter's reply. That reply was immediately condemned by some bishops, and a general anathema pronounced against the heresiarch. There followed the reading of the letter of Celestine and the Roman synod to Cyril (*Epist.* XII), and the synodal letter of Cyril and the council of Egyptian bishops (*Epist.* XVII).[120] Lastly, against a Patristic memoir compiled from the writings of the Fathers on the Incarnation [121] there was arrayed a collection of twenty

the opening of the Council in the absence of the Orientals (Mansi, IV, 1232, 1236). As to the question of Cyril's delegation by the Pope, we find indeed Cyril always designated in the acts as "holding the place of the archbishop of Rome" (v. g. Mansi, IV, 1124); but, on the other hand, there is no letter of the Pope to Cyril conveying a special delegation for the Council; Celestine had sent special legates to Ephesus. Cyril evidently stretched the faculties he had received for the execution of the Roman sentence against Nestorius to cover the Council of Ephesus.

[117] Mansi, V, 765.

[118] Mansi, V, 770.

[119] Or rather the *Church Mary;* cf. Duchesne, *op. cit.,* p. 349, note 3.

[120] The reader will notice that, whilst the IVth letter of St. Cyril to Nestorius was declared to be in conformity with the faith, the XVIIth letter, which included the anathematisms, was not directly approved.

[121] These texts were taken from Peter of Alexandria, St. Athanasius, Popes Julius I and Felix I, Theophilus of Alexandria, St. Cyprian, St. Ambrose, St. Gregory of Nazianzus, Atticus of Constantinople and

fragments taken from the writings of Nestorius. When it was seen that the Patriarch persevered in his errors, he was "excluded from the episcopal dignity and from all priestly communion." A hundred and ninety-eight bishops, who were joined later on by a few more, subscribed to that sentence,[122] which the people of Ephesus received with joyful acclamation.

This took place on June 22, 431. A few days later, the Pope's legates arrived. They brought a very resolute letter from Celestine to the Council.[123] He said it was not his intention that Nestorius be judged again; the decision of the Roman Council sufficed; the Council of Ephesus had merely to promulgate that decision and make it ecumenical.[124] In the third session (July 11), after the reading of the official minutes of the first session, the legates confirmed the measures taken; a synodal letter, which set forth all the proceedings and asked that the bishops be allowed to return to their dioceses, was sent to the Emperors.[125] With the condemnation of Nestorius the doctrinal work of the Council almost came to an end; it was completed, though merely accessorily, in the sixth session, by the condemnation of a symbol ascribed to Theodore of Mopsuestia,[126] and by a prohibition to draw up and spread abroad any other formula of faith than that of the Fathers of Nicæa.[127]

Amphilochius of Iconium. The two fragments credited to Popes Julius and Felix are apocryphal and have Apollinaris for their real author.

[122] Hence thirty-eight bishops must have joined the hundred and sixty bishops who were present at the beginning of the session.

[123] Mansi, IV, 1284.

[124] Notice how the authority of Rome is affirmed by Firmus of Cæsarea and the legate Philip (Mansi, 1288, 1289, 1296).

[125] Mansi, IV, 1301.

[126] This is the *Expositio Symboli depravati*, Swete, II, 327.

[127] "The Holy Synod decrees that it is unlawful for any one to bring forward, or to write, or to compose another [symbol of] faith, besides that established by the holy Fathers assembled in Nicæa with the Holy Ghost. Those who shall dare to compose another [symbol of] faith,

The doctrinal task of the Council was now completed; there still remained the more difficult task of getting its decisions accepted. As early as June 26, before the coming of the Papal legates, John of Antioch and his bishops had arrived at Ephesus, and immediately joined the ranks of the dissenting bishops. They hastily held a clandestine meeting,[128] in which they deposed Cyril and Memnon as guilty of violence and even of heresy, and excommunicated those bishops who had sat with them. Forty-three bishops subscribed to that sentence, which was delivered to the Emperors and the princesses, and to the clergy, senate and people of Constantinople.[129] This meant a regular war which it would be useless to relate in detail. While condemning its opponents, each party tried to win the support of the Emperor and of the court; and the Emperor, more or less uncertain, did not know for which side to declare in a case where there were so many personalities mixed up with the question of faith. However, this much was settled: Nestorius was deposed from the see of Constantinople (October 25, 431), and succeeded by Maximian, a kind-hearted and moderate prelate, who showed himself favorable to Cyril.

or express it, or offer it to persons desiring to turn to the acknowledgment of the truth, whether from heathenism, or from Judaism, or from any heresy whatsoever, shall be deposed, if they be bishops or clerics; bishops, from the episcopate, and clerics from the clergy; and if they be laymen, they shall be anathematized." (Mansi, IV, 1361, 1364; cf. also *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers,* 2d series, vol. XIV, p. 231.) The Fathers of the Council of Chalcedon were the first to transgress this prohibition by enacting the so-called Symbol of Constantinople.

[128] See the acts in Mansi, IV, 1260 sqq.

[129] See the letters in Mansi, IV, 1269, 1272, 1273, 1276, 1277. Granting that the first session of the Council under Cyril is open to criticism, what must be thought of John of Antioch and his Oriental bishops, judging and condemning Cyril and his hundred and fifty-eight bishops hastily and before hearing them? And yet, this absolutely irregular gathering is by some historians regarded as the "legitimate" council!

Cyrillians and Orientals were unable to come to any agreement till the death of Pope Celestine (July 16, 432). The new Pope, Xystus III (July 31, 432), while approving the decisions of Ephesus, expressed his wish that the Orientals be received back into the communion of faith, provided they subscribed to the condemnation passed by the Council.[130] Theodosius II again played the mediator. Cyril, who was still suspected of Apollinarianism, explained that he absolutely rejected any kind of change and mixture of divinity and humanity in Jesus Christ. This explanation satisfied many of his opponents, and soon there arose three parties among the Orientals. One, which was in favor of peace, accepted, if not the wording itself, at least the substance of Cyril's teaching and was willing to give up, if needed, the person of Nestorius; its leaders were John of Antioch and Acacius of Berea. Another party was made up of determined Nestorians, for whom Cyril, whatever he might say or do, always remained *the* enemy; Alexander of Hierapolis, Helladius of Tarsus and a few others belonged to it. Lastly, there was a middle party that drew its inspiration from Theodoret and Andrew of Samosata; its members did not know exactly what to do, and whilst mistrusting the Patriarch of Alexandria, were unwilling to condemn Nestorius and not over-anxious for conciliation.

Yet, conciliation was desired by most bishops; and it was to promote the interest of peace that John of Antioch sent Paul of Emesa to Alexandria with credentials for Cyril, and a profession of faith that was to serve as the basis of an agreement. That profession of faith reproduced almost literally a declaration which the Orientals had previously submitted to the Emperor.[131] Cyril accepted it; but he

[130] MANSI, V, 374, 375.

[131] MANSI, V, 781, 783. This declaration had probably been composed by Theodoret.

demanded, besides, the explicit condemnation of Nestorius by Paul of Emesa and his principals. This point was granted him first by Paul, then by John of Antioch. The latter sent to the Patriarch of Alexandria the final letter of agreement, which contained the profession of faith just mentioned;[132] Cyril answered by the letter *Laetentur caeli,*[133] which reproduced the same symbol. Peace was thus reëstablished between the two patriarchs (March and April 433).

The formula on which they agreed is of course very important, since it embodies the points held in common by the two schools of Alexandria and Antioch, and acquaints us with the sacrifices of particular terminology which both schools had consented to make for the sake of peace. After a sort of introduction, the formula says:

"We confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, true God and true man, [consisting] of a reasonable soul and a body, was begotten before all time by the Father according to the Godhead, but at the end of the days, for us and for our salvation, [was born] of the Virgin, according to the manhood; of one substance with the Father according to the Godhead, and of one substance with us according to the manhood. For two natures are united together. Therefore we acknowledge one Christ, one Lord, and one Son. On account of this union, which, however, is remote from all mingling, we acknowledge also that the holy Virgin is the mother of God, because God the Word was made flesh and man, and from the moment of conception united with Himself the temple which He assumed from her. As regards, however, the evangelical and apostolic utterances concerning Christ, we know that theologians apply them differently: one class, [having reference] to one

[132] *Inter epist. Cyrill., Epist.* XXXVIII.
[133] *Epist.* XXXIX.

person and so unifying; the other class [having reference] to both natures and so separating; one class, suitable to God, [as applying] to Christ in His divinity; the other class, humiliating, as [applying] to Him in His humanity." [134]

Reading this formula we can see at once that, after all, it was chiefly St. Cyril who surrendered his own peculiar views. In the text of the formula, no reference is made to the Word, but to Jesus Christ, born of the Father in His divinity, and born of Mary in His humanity. The *θεοτόκος* was admitted, but with the qualification demanded by the Orientals; their favorite word *ναός* was there; the terms *μία φύσις, ἕνωσις φυσική* were replaced by *ἓν πρόσωπον, δύο φύσεων ἕνωσις, ὡς ἐπὶ δύο φύσεων*, which, whilst designating the unity of person, expressed also the duality of natures. However, the personal identity of the Word before the Incarnation with Jesus Christ was acknowledged and asserted several times; *ἕνωσις* was substituted for *συνάφεια*; both the principle of the *communicatio idiomatum*, and the *θεοτόκος* were accepted. However, if Cyril did not find his terminology in the formula, he did find in it his doctrine, for he had never dreamt of identifying the humanity with the divinity in Jesus Christ. He was broad-minded enough to look beyond the words and, no doubt, realized, even at that early period,

134 *Ὁμολογοῦμεν τοιγαροῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸν μονογενῆ, θεὸν τέλειον καὶ ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος· πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα· ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ τὸν αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, καὶ ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα· δύο γὰρ φύσεων ἕνωσις γέγονε· διὸ ἕνα Χριστόν, ἕνα υἱόν, ἕνα κύριον ὁμολογοῦμεν. Κατὰ ταύτην τὴν τῆς ἀσυγχύτου ἑνώσεως ἔννοιαν ὁμολογοῦμεν τὴν ἁγίαν παρθένον θεοτόκον, διὰ τὸ τὸν θεὸν λόγον σαρκωθῆναι καὶ ἐνανθρωπῆσαι, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς συλλήψεως ἑνῶσαι ἑαυτῷ τὸν ἐξ αὐτῆς ληφθέντα ναόν. Τὰς δὲ εὐαγγελικὰς καὶ ἀποστολικὰς περὶ τοῦ κυρίου φωνὰς ἴσμεν τοὺς θεολόγους ἄνδρας τὰς μὲν κοινοποιοῦντας ὡς ἐφ' ἑνὸς προσώπου, τὰς δὲ διαιροῦντας, ὡς ἐπὶ δύο φύσεων· καὶ τὰς μὲν θεοπρεπεῖς κατὰ τὴν θεότητα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὰς δὲ ταπεινὰς κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα αὐτοῦ παραδιδόντας.*

that these words could be made to agree with the particular form of his doctrine. By subscribing to the formula of peace he gave his opponents the best proof of his sincerity and orthodoxy.

As has been said, peace was restored between the two patriarchs. But the agreement had to be ratified by the two contending parties. On Cyril's side, besides misinformed theologians, like Isidore of Pelusium,[135] there were genuine Monophysites, like Acacius of Melitene,[136] who charged the Patriarch of Alexandria with having betrayed the cause of truth by accepting the formulary. Cyril had to take up his pen and defend both himself — this time against his friends — and the act of union. This he did in several letters, in which he endeavored to show that the doctrine of the formulary did not substantially differ from that which he had always maintained.[137] On the side of John of Antioch, the opposition was just as intense. Besides the group of the Cilicians, who persisted in proclaiming Cyril a heretic and the agreement of no value whatever,[138] Theodoret and his friends, who were fairly satisfied with Cyril's explanations, were plainly opposed to the deposition of Nestorius.[139] At the instigation of John of Antioch, Theodosius II again intervened. Through the Emperor's influence, the dissenters gradually yielded,— all but fifteen, who were deposed.[140] Theodoret himself accepted the symbol, although he refused to condemn Nestorius. In the year 435, Theodosius, in order to remove the cause of the conflict, took

[135] *Epistul.*, lib. I, 323, 324 (*P. G.*, LXXVIII).
[136] Mansi, V, 860.
[137] *Epist.* XL, XLIV, XLV, XLVI, to Acacius, Eulogius, Succensus.
[138] Mansi, V, 890.
[139] See Theodoret's letter to Nestorius, Mansi, V, 898; *P. G.*, LXXXIII, 1485. (*Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers,* 2d series, vol. III, p. 344.)
[140] Mansi, V, 965.

Nestorius away from the monastery of Euprepius and exiled him to Petra in Arabia, and later to the Oasis of Egypt. It was there that Nestorius, in the midst of many vexations, wrote his recently found apology, which he entitled *Book of Heraclides of Damascus*. He died in the year 451, between the convocation and the holding of the Council of Chalcedon.

§ 5. The End of Nestorianism.[141]

Being thus pursued in those provinces where the Emperor's influence was paramount, Nestorianism first found a refuge in Edessa, the city that guarded the frontier in the East. There was, in that city, a celebrated school, which was frequented not only by the Osrhoenian subjects of the Emperor, but also by the Christian Persians subject to the Sassanides; and for this reason it was called the Persians' school. There the name and teaching of Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia were held in high esteem. True, Bishop Rabbulas, after championing the cause of John of Antioch, had passed over, during the winter of 431–432, to Cyril's side, and had even denounced to the latter Theodore of Mopsuestia as the real author of Nestorianism;[142] nay, he had done his best to suppress Theodore's writings; but, both among the clergy and in the school, he met with a resistance which, silent as it was on account of his extreme severity, was all the more deep-seated. After he died (435), there ensued a reaction that brought to the episcopal see one of his opponents. Ibas was an orthodox theologian of Theodoret's type. Though he regretted very much that Nestorius did not accept the

[141] On this subject cf. J. Labourt, *Le christianisme dans l'empire perse sous la dynastie sassanide* (224–632), Paris, 1904. W. A. Wigram, *An Introduction to the History of the Assyrian Church*, London, 1910; and the sources referred to by these two authors.

[142] Mansi, V, 976.

θεοτόκος, he was a sworn enemy of St. Cyril, and a determined supporter of Theodore of Mopsuestia, whose works he had translated into Syriac and spread among his friends. Besides, he had written, probably in the year 433, to Maris, Bishop of Ardaschir,[143] a famous letter in which he gave, from an Oriental point of view, a full account of the Council of Ephesus and the agreement between John and Cyril, and strongly protested against the fanatic zeal with which Rabbulas was hunting down Theodore's writings. Later on, we shall have occasion to study that letter, which brought much trouble on Ibas. No wonder that under such a bishop, and in spite of the presence of a comparatively few resolute Monophysites recruited from the student-body,[144] the school of Edessa was able to keep up its Nestorian sympathies.

However evil days soon came upon it. In the year 457, under Nonnus, the successor of Ibas, the orthodox party succeeded in getting the upper hand and forced the warmest supporters of Theodore of Mopsuestia, among them Barsumas and Narses, to go into exile.[145] They crossed the Persian frontier, and Barsumas, who became bishop of Nisibis, founded in that city a school of which Narses, "the harp of the Holy Ghost," was for fifty years the much respected master. When, in 489, Bishop Cyrus of Edessa definitively closed the "School of the Persians," by command of the Emperor Zeno, the expelled teachers and pupils crossed the frontier and found hospitality at Nisibis. There, in their isolation from the Byzantine world, their excessive

[143] Beit-Ardaschir was the capital of Seleucian Persia. The bishop of Seleucia at that time was Dadiso. Labourt (*op. cit.*, p. 133, note 6) thinks that the name Maris, given by Greek authors, is merely a reproduction of the Syriac honorary title *Mari* (*My Lord, Monsignor*) placed before the name of the Bishop of Ardaschir.

[144] Philoxenus, who later on became bishop of Mabboug, was then one of the scholars.

[145] Mgr. Duchesne places this exodus in the years 449–450, after the deposition of Ibas (*Hist. Anc. de l'Eglise*, III, 568, note).

dyophysite tendencies could but increase; Nisibis remained for many years the doctrinal stronghold of Nestorianism.

In order to render that isolation more complete, Barsumas did his best to make the Persian Church an absolutely autonomous community. For this purpose, he did not hesitate to instigate the heathen to persecute the orthodox, by representing to King Peroz (457–484) that he could not depend upon the fidelity of his Christian subjects, unless they gave up religious communion with the Emperor of Byzantium. Barsumas succeeded admirably in his purpose, and the Church of the Sassanide kingdom was forever separated from the Greek Church of Constantinople. The former acknowledged for its supreme ruler, its *catholicos,* the bishop of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, and in a comparatively short time, in spite of its internal dissensions, and in spite of the persecutions it endured afterwards, made many converts and spread its conquests far and wide. The historian Cosmas Indicopleustes,[146] who wrote about the middle of the 6th century, relates that, at that time, the islands of Socotora and Ceylon held intercourse with Persia, and that there was at Ceylon a church that depended on the *catholicos* of Seleucia-Ctesiphon. It was through Ceylon, which was the main thoroughfare between the Persian Gulf and China, that the Nestorians first brought Christianity to Tartary and became in the Far East the precursors of St. Francis Xavier and later Catholic missionaries. This extensive religious organization was broken up in the 7th century by the Mohammedans and in the 13th and 14th centuries by the Mongolian invaders. There remains hardly a vestige of it today.

From a doctrinal point of view, the dissenting Nestorians at first regarded St. Leo's letter to Flavian and the decrees

[146] Χριστιανικὴ τοπογραφία πάντος κοσμοῦ, lib. XI (*P. G.,* LXXXVIII, 445).

of Chalcedon which affirmed the duality of natures in Christ as a victory for their cause.[147] But, at least in Persia, they preferred to stand by the peace agreement of 433, which seemed still more in their favor; the more so as, in that country, Nestorius was comparatively unknown, and it was to Theodore of Mopsuestia that appeal was made. Zeno's *Henoticon* (482), which was followed by the closing of the school of Edessa and the definitive establishment of that of Nisibis, gave an impetus to the movement towards heterodoxy. The θεοτόκος was hardly mentioned, except to be condemned; the *communicatio idiomatum* and the definition given by the Council of Chalcedon of the word *hypostasis* — a definition which identified it with πρόσωπον — were both rejected. Ὑπόστασις continued to be compared to φύσις, and Christ was declared to be in two natures, two hypostases and one person.[148] This is the teaching found in the first canon of Chalcedon of 486,[149] and in the homily of Narses on the "three great doctors," Diodore, Theodore, and Nestorius[150] (probably of the year 485–490), in which the formula of the year 433 is denounced, as well as the Council of Ephesus.

However, there was a return to a less rigid symbol during the 6th century, probably owing to the relations of the Persians with the Byzantines, under the rule of the Emperors

[147] Cf. the *Book of Heraclides*, pp. 327, 330.

[148] The corresponding Syriac words are *kianâ* = φύσις; *gnoumâ* = ὑπόστασις; *parsopâ* = πρόσωπον. Regarding the meaning of those words, cf. BETHUNE-BAKER, *Nestorius and His Teaching*, p. 217 and foll.; WIGRAM, *op. cit.*, p. 278 and foll. This terminology became definitely settled only after the year 612 (WIGRAM, pp. 256, 278).

[149] *Synodicon orientale*, edit. J. B. CHABOT, p. 302. Cf. LABOURT, *op. cit.*, p. 262; cf. 147. That document makes no special mention of two hypostases.

[150] Edit. MARTIN in *Journal asiatique* (July, 1900). Cf. LABOURT, *op. cit.*, pp. 263–265; and also *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, in *Texts and Studies*, VIII, I, p. 5.

Justin and Justinian. More moderate views are found in the profession of faith of the *catholicos* Maraba, written in 540,[151] and in the treatise of Thomas of Edessa *On the Birth of our Lord Jesus Christ*.[152] The condemnation of the "Three Chapters" by the general Council of the year 553, was upheld by the dissenting followers of Henana, who had taken sides with the Byzantines,[153] and raised a strong protest at a council held in 585 by the *catholicos* Isoyahb I; but the doctrinal attitude of the protesting party was in no way affected thereby. The second symbol of Isoyahb teaches that "Our Lord God Jesus Christ, who was begotten of the Father before all the worlds, in His divinity, was born in the flesh, of Mary ever virgin, in the last ages, the same indeed, but not in the same way." It goes on to assert that "God the Word has borne the humiliation of suffering in the temple of His body, economically, through the supreme and indissoluble union." However, the *catholicos* does not say that God died, or that Mary is the mother of God, and he speaks merely of a *prosopic* union;[154] yet he evidently admits the unity of person in Jesus Christ.

The same doctrine is also held by Babai the Great, abbot of Izla (569–628), in his treatise *De Unione,* which settled the official teaching of the Persian Church.[155] Babai rejects

[151] *Synodicon orientale,* p. 551 and foll.; cf. LABOURT, p. 267.

[152] *Thomae Edesseni tractatus De nativitate Domini nostri Christi,* edit. J. CARR, Rome, 1898. The reader will notice, however, that in that treatise the formula *Deus crucifixus atque mortuus* is never used (transl., p. 36).

[153] Henana was charged by the Nestorians with being a Chaldæan, an Origenist, and a heretic on the subject of the Incarnation. The *catholicos* Sabriso profited by that occasion to renew the error of Theodore of Mopsuestia as regards the non-existence of original sin and Adam's primitive state (*Synodic. orient.,* p. 459; LABOURT, p. 279).

[154] *Synod. orient.,* pp. 454, 455; LABOURT, p. 277; WIGRAM, p. 275.

[155] This treatise has never been edited. Extracts from it have been published by Labourt, on whose work the following statements are based (*op. cit.,* p. 280 and foll.).

absolutely the *communicatio idiomatum, i.e.,* the mutual exchange of properties between the two natures; but he admits "the exchange of names;" in other words, he holds that we may attribute to Christ, considered after the Incarnation and in His two natures, the actions, passions, and properties of either nature. Thus, we must not say that God died, but, because of the πρόσωπον of the union, that the Son of God was delivered for us, the word Son designating here the Word Incarnate. Babai takes the word nature (*kianâ*) in an abstract sense as designating the common element found in all the particular hypostases, and comprising all those of the same kind. Hypostasis (*qnoumâ*) is a concrete and individual substance: "We call hypostasis," Babai writes, "an individual substance (οὐσία), subsisting in its one being, numerically one and separated from many [others], not as *individuating,* but inasmuch as it receives, in rational and free creatures, diverse accidents of virtue and crime, knowledge and ignorance, and also, in irrational beings, diverse accidents, as the result of contrary temperaments, or in any other way." As to person (*parsopâ*), it is "that property by which an hypostasis is distinct from other hypostases," and by means of which two hypostases of the same nature and kind, for instance, Peter and Paul, are distinct from one another. For Peter and Paul have the same nature; besides, both agree also in that they are hypostases, *i.e.,* concrete and existing substances; but the hypostasis of one is not the hypostasis of the other; each has its own individual property, which makes them distinct persons: "and, since the special property which an hypostasis possesses is not the hypostasis itself, we [call] person that distinguishing element." If, according to Babai, that special property is not the property of existing by itself (καθ' ἑαυτόν), it can be but the combination of the various accidents of which he has given several instances;

and thus we may say that in his eyes personality is merely the combination of the accidental characters of which an hypostasis is the substantial substratum and by which it is distinguished from other hypostases: — a very superficial and inaccurate notion.

Anyhow, we can readily understand why Babai and all those who, like him, identified hypostasis (*qnoumâ*) with a concrete substance, an existing and real nature, could not admit in Christ an hypostatic union; as that would have resulted in unity of substance and nature. This is precisely what Nestorius had said. Babai rejects, then, the hypostatic union and admits only the *prosopic* union. There are in Jesus Christ two natures (*kiané*), two hypostases (*qnoumé*) and one person (*parsopâ*).[156]

As to the Antiochian expressions, *adhesion, indwelling, assumption,* used to signify the union of the two natures, Babai accepts them all, but, in his eyes, they do not suffice to express the mystery of the Incarnation: "One must speak both of an indwelling and of a unitive and prosopic adhesion. This unspeakable union takes place according to all these modes and even in a transcendent way."

Nestorian orthodoxy, thus defined by Babai, did not materially develop much in later ages. From the profession of faith drawn up by the bishops in 612,[157] we can see that the θεοτόκος continued to be left aside, and from the history of the *catholicos* Isoyahb II (628–643),[158] that it was looked upon as blasphemous. The theological teaching of the *catholicos* Timothy I (728–823) added nothing new to the doctrine just set forth.[159]

[156] As Nestorian theology, on the other hand, held there were in the Trinity three *qnoumé*, three hypostases in the Cappadocian sense, we can readily see what confusion prevailed in the terminology.

[157] Labourt, pp. 226, 227; Wigram, 277.

[158] Labourt, p. 243.

[159] Cf. J. Labourt, *De Timotheo I, nestorianorum patriarcha,* ch. III, Paris, 1904.

§ 6. The Christology of St. Cyril.[160]

St. Cyril was unquestionably the chief champion of orthodoxy against Nestorianism. He was opposed by the Oriental bishops, whereas, on the other hand, the Monophysite leaders, such as Dioscorus, Timothy, Severus, and Philoxenus, appealed to him in support of their teaching. It is then, most important to form an exact idea of his Christological teaching and to see how that teaching, which was declared orthodox by the councils, came to be represented by the dissenters as contrary to the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon.

We must first define the meaning in which the Patriarch of Alexandria uses the expressions employed in the controversy. For the Antiochian school, the words φύσις and ὑπόστασις, in Christology, were synonymous, meaning a concrete substance with its essential properties and faculties. In opposition to them stood πρόσωπον, which signified a complete individual, or an independent person. For Cyril — when dealing with Christology[161] — these three words, φύσις, ὑπόστασις, πρόσωπον, mostly designate the same thing, *viz.*, a concrete individual, an independent person, existing by itself. That Cyril identifies φύσις and ὑπόστασις, is beyond question; he often uses the one for the other, and thus shows that he regards them as synonymous.[162] That

[160] On this particular topic, cf. A. Rehrmann, *Die Christologie des hl. Cyrillus von Alexandrien*, Hildesheim, 1902. J. Mahé, *Les anathématismes de saint Cyrille et les évêques orientaux du patriarchat d'Antioche*, in the *Revue d'histoire ecclés.*, VII (1906). J. Lebon, *Le monophysisme sévérien*, Louvain, 1909.

[161] In treating of the Trinity, he uses the words φύσις and ὑπόστασις in the meaning assigned to them by the Cappadocians: μία γὰρ ἡ θεότητος φύσις ἐν τρισὶν ὑποστάσεσιν ἰδικαῖς νοουμένη (*Adv. Nestor. blasph.*, V, 6, col. 240).

[162] For instance, *Apolog. contra Theodoretum*, anath. II, col. 401: ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ Λόγου φύσις ἤγουν ὑπόστασις. Epist. XVII, col. 116: ὑποστάσει μιᾷ, τῇ τοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένῃ, where ὑπόστασις is substituted for φύσις.

he gives them the sense of *person,* is just as evident.[163] Now and then he brings together ὑπόστασις and πρόσωπον as meaning the same thing: for instance, in the IVth anathematism: Εἴ τις προσώποις δυσὶν ἤγουν ὑποστάσεσι . . ., and in the defense of the same anathematism.[164] In the justification of the IId anathematism against Theodoret, he writes: ἡ τοῦ Λόγου φύσις ἡ ὑπόστασις ὅ ἐστιν αὐτὸς ὁ Λόγος.[165] In the XLVth letter[166] he says that Jesus Christ is the one and only Son, and, as has been taught by the Fathers, one only incarnate φύσις of the Word God. In connection with his XLVIth epistle, 2, he answers the following objection: if there is but one incarnate φύσις of the Word God, there has been a mixture and fusion of the two natures. Cyril makes it clear that for him the word φύσις means a concrete and independent nature, *i.e.,* a person.[167] The same may be said of another passage in the same epistle (4), where he rejects the expression, Jesus Christ suffered τῇ φύσει τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος.[168] This conclusion also results from his whole doctrinal attitude. Had not φύσις meant for him an individual existing by itself, we should be at a loss to explain why he always saw in the δύο φύσεις of his opponents the affirmation of two persons in Jesus Christ, since he himself admits the existence of a distinct and complete humanity. *When he uses his own terminology,* Cyril never calls that humanity φύσις.[169]

When Cyril, writing on some Trinitarian subject, uses the word ὑπόστασις in the sense of person, he adds to it the word ἰδική (cf. the preceding note and the *De recta fide ad regin.,* I, col. 1272).

[163] J. Lebon, *Le monophysisme sévérien,* p. 250 and foll., 277 and foll.

[164] Col. 332 C and 336 D.

[165] Col. 401 A.

[166] Col. 232.

[167] Col. 241.

[168] Col. 245.

[169] I say: *When he uses his own terminology;* for, on several occa-

These preliminary remarks are very important for a true understanding of St. Cyril's Christology. We may now take up the details of his teaching.

Whilst the Antiochians start from the two united natures, Cyril starts from the person of the Word itself; for it is always the Word who holds the foreground in his Christology, the person of Jesus Christ being the same as that of the Word, since Jesus Christ is the Word in His incarnate state.

The Word is complete in His divinity, ἐν θεότητι τέλειος; but the humanity which He assumes and in which He exists, is also complete, κατά γε τὸν τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος λόγον, and made up of a body and a rational soul.[170] The Patriarch plainly rejects Apollinarianism. He quite often uses the word σάρξ to designate the humanity of Jesus Christ; but he does this, not, as he himself explains, in order to deny the intelligent soul, but following *John,* I, 14.[171]

The complete Word, then unites to Himself a complete humanity. Of what kind is that union? Cyril uses various terms to designate it, such as ἕνωσις, συνδρομή, σύνοδος;[172] but the one he uses most often, is ἕνωσις. This word marks the act of the union itself, the *unitio,* the term of which is designated by the accompanying qualificative, φυσική or καθ' ὑπόστασιν.

That union does not consist in a mere exterior relation of adaptation or indwelling, between the Word and the humanity: οὐ κατὰ συνάφειαν ἁπλῶς ὡς γοῦν ἐκεῖνός (Nestorius)

sions, he had to employ his opponents' language, particularly when he had to prove that he admitted no confusion of the two elements in Jesus Christ.

[170] *De recta fide ad reg.,* I, 13, col. 1221; *De incarn. unigeniti,* col. 1208, 1220; *Quod unus sit Christus,* col. 1292.

[171] *Epist.* XLVI, 1, col. 240.

[172] For instance, *De incarn. unigeniti.* col. 1208, where the three terms are used one after the other.

φησι, τὴν θύρατεν ἐπινοουμένην, ἤτοι σχετικήν.[173] θεωρεῖς ὡς σφόδρα ἀλλότριος ἐπὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ τῆς ἐνοικήσεως ὅρος.[174]

On the other hand, it did not take place by a conversion or change of one of the two elements into the other. The Word was not changed into the flesh: γέγονε σὰρξ ὁ Λόγος οὐ κατὰ μετάστασιν ἢ τροπήν.[175] Christ did not fashion His body from His divine substance, but took it from Mary.[176] Likewise, as we shall see presently, the flesh or the humanity was not transformed into the Word, but remained in its own substance.[177]

Nor has there been a fusion of the Word and the humanity, so as to make a *tertium quid* that would be neither one nor the other. Cyril was often charged with this error, but he always repudiated the accusation.

"He is very ignorant," he writes, "who affirms that there has been confusion and admixture."[178]—"Considering, as I have said, the way the Incarnation has taken place, we see that the two natures have been united together indissolubly, without confusion and transformation (ἀσυγχύτως καὶ ἀτρέπτως); for the flesh is flesh, and not the divinity, even though it has become the flesh of God; likewise, the Word is God and not flesh, even though, through the economy, He has made the flesh His own."[179]

Some ancient Fathers had made use of the word κρᾶσις to

[173] *Adv. Nestor. blasphem.*, II, prooem., col. 60.

[174] *Quod B. Maria sit deipara*, 8, col. 265.

[175] *De recta fide ad reg.*, II, 22, col. 1364; II, 2, col. 1340; *De incarn. unigen.*, col. 1197, 1200, 1220; *Quod unus sit Christus*, col. 1289; *Epist.* IV, col. 45.

[176] *Epist.* XLV, col. 232 C.

[177] Cf. *Epist.* XLVI, col. 241 B. Cyril wrote a treatise against the Synousiasts, of which some fragments still remain, *P. G.*, LXXVI, 1427 and foll.

[178] Περιττοεπὴς ὁ λέγων φυρμὸν γενέσθαι καὶ σύγκρασιν (*Quod unus sit Christus*, col. 1292).

[179] *Epist.* XLV, col. 232.

designate the union of the Word and the humanity in Jesus Christ, and Cyril knew this; but, as he says, they did not intend to designate thereby a true mixture, as in liquids; they meant merely to express the closeness of the union.[180]

Thus, in the union, each element of the Word Incarnate remained "in its natural property": *ἐν ἰδιότητι τῇ κατὰ φύσιν ἑκατέρου μένοντός τε καὶ νοουμένου.*[181] The Word remained what He was, *μεμενηκότος δὲ ὅπερ ἦν*:[182] on the other hand, the humanity exists in its nature of humanity:

"I also confess," Cyril writes, "that there is a great difference and distance between the divinity and the humanity; for these two things vary as to the quality of their being (*κατά γε τὸν τοῦ πῶς εἶναι λόγον*), and they seem in no way alike. But, as soon as mention is made of Christ's mystery, the concept of the union does not indeed ignore the differences, but excludes the division; it does not mix up or confound the natures (*οὐ συγχέων ἢ ἀνακιρνῶν τὰς φύσεις*); but, since the Word of God has shared in the flesh and blood, we can readily perceive and say that there is but one Son."[183]

In these words Cyril asserts the existence of a true human nature in Jesus Christ after the union and gives the technical expression which he uses to designate that nature. As has been remarked, that expression is not *φύσις*, but *ἰδιότης ἡ κατὰ φύσιν*, or *ὁ τοῦ πῶς εἶναι λόγος*, or rather *ποιότης φυσική*, as he himself says, in joining the two formulas.[184] This is the nature proper, inasmuch as it is opposed to person, *φύσις, ὑπόστασις* or *πρόσωπον*.

[180] *Adv. Nestor. blasph.*, I, 3, col. 33.
[181] *Epist.* XLVI, col. 241 B.
[182] *Adv. Nest. blasph.*, II, 1, col. 65. Cf. *De recta fide ad reg.*, I, 4; II, 9, 16, 27, 33, 37.
[183] *Adv. Nestor. blasph.*, II, 6, col. 85. Cf. also *Apolog. contra orientales*, col. 329 D; *Apolog. contra Theodoret.*, col. 425 A.
[184] *Epist.* XL, col. 193 B, D.

Moreover, Christ's humanity does not preserve its intimate being only, but also its properties, *i.e.,* its passibility, weaknesses, needs and passions. It suffered hunger, thirst and the evil treatments inflicted upon it.[185]

Hence, and since Jesus Christ is thus both true man and true God, He is consubstantial with His mother as well as with His Father: ὁμοούσιον τῇ μητρὶ ὡς τῷ πατρὶ, καθὼς οἱ πατέρες εἰρήκασιν.[186]

However, what we have quoted simply declares in what the union does *not* consist, but gives no positive idea of its real nature. On this last point Cyril does not hesitate to say that we are left in ignorance, and that at bottom the unity of Jesus Christ exceeds our comprehension and is unspeakable. The divinity and the humanity are joined ξένως τε καὶ ὑπὲρ νοῦν: the ἕνωσις is ἀδιάτμητος καὶ ὑπὲρ νοῦν.[187] The Apollinarians claim that two complete natures cannot be Christ's constituent parts, because this would make two sons and two Christs; but we do not know the extent of the divine power. Tradition has handed down to us the fact of Jesus Christ's personal unity; we have to accept it.[188]

However, though the mystery of the Incarnation eludes the grasp of our minds, we can obtain some idea of the relations which that mystery established between the Word and the humanity, and ascertain their results.

St. Cyril teaches that the union began with the conception of Jesus. It is not a man who was born of Mary, but the Word of God according to the humanity. "For there was not born of the Holy Virgin, first an ordinary man, into whom the Word afterwards came down; but, having united

[185] *De incarn. unig.,* col. 1213, 1216; cf. *Epist.* XL, col. 192; XLVI, 1, col. 240.

[186] *Quod sancta virgo deipara sit,* col. 252.

[187] *Quod unus sit Christus,* col. 1292.

[188] *De incarn. unigen.,* col. 1208, 1209; *Epist.* IV, col. 45; XLV, col. 232.

Himself [to the flesh] in the womb [of Mary, the Word] was born according to the flesh, ascribing to Himself the birth of a flesh that is His own."[189] The union is, then, ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς συλλήψεως. It is the Word who fashions His own body from the Blessed Virgin.[190] Against this oft-repeated affirmation it has been objected that St. Cyril apparently admits that there was a time before the union when the Word and the man existed as two distinct beings, since he says that *after the union* Jesus Christ is but one nature out of two natures that have united.[191] But we must observe that he refers merely to the logical order and the consideration of the mind (ὅσον μὲν ἦκεν εἰς ἔννοιαν, καὶ εἷς γε μόνον τὸ ὁρᾶν τοῖς τῆς ψυχῆς ὄμμασι).[192] The mind beholds in the Incarnate Word a twofold ποιότης φυσική, together with one only person; if it discards the union for the time being, that twofold ποιότης will appear as two persons or two φύσεις; but presently the thought of the union comes forward and does away with that duality. This whole process is subjective and takes place only ἐν ἐννοίαις, ἐν θεωρίᾳ.

From this there has resulted one only being, one Christ, one Son, one Lord: ἕνα Χριστὸν, ἕνα υἱὸν, ἕνα κύριον ὁμολογοῦμεν.[193] Cyril composed a treatise, *Quod unus sit Christus*, for the very purpose of demonstrating that unity. However, to speak of Christ's unity as *resulting* from the union is not in keeping with the Cyrillian Christology. For Cyril, Christ is one, not *through*, but *in spite of*, the union. Before the Incarnation, the Word is a πρόσωπον, a ὑπόστασις, a φύσις, all these words designating person. Through an incomprehensible union, the Word has made His own a humanity taken from the Blessed Virgin; but He has undergone no

[189] *Epist.* IV, col. 45.
[190] *Epist.* XXXIX, col. 177; I, col. 28.
[191] *Epist.* XL, col. 192 D, 193 C; XLV, col. 232 D.
[192] Cf. also *Epist.* XLIV, 225.
[193] *Epist.* XXXIX, col. 177; *De incarn. unigen.*, col. 1208.

change because of that union; His person has remained what it was; it only exists in a new state, it is σεσαρκωμένη. As to the humanity He has assumed, since it has never existed nor exists ἰδικῶς and καθ' ἑαυτήν, it cannot be a φύσις, nor an hypostasis, nor a person. Thus the personal unity of the Word is in no way altered by the Incarnation. Jesus Christ is one sole person just as strictly as is the Λόγος ἄσαρκος. Nay, He is absolutely the same person. It has been rightly observed that this is the central point of St. Cyril's Christology. The union is καθ' ὑπόστασιν,[194] not in the sense that it produces an hypostasis that did not exist before, but in the sense that it associates a humanity to the preëxisting hypostasis of the Word. The union is a ἕνωσις φυσική, κατὰ φύσιν,[195] not in the sense that a new φύσις results therefrom, but because a humanity is ineffably joined to the φύσις of the Word. There is but one φύσις in Jesus Christ, the eternal φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου, which has become σεσαρκωμένη in time.

The texts on which this presentation of St. Cyril's teaching is based, are numerous. These are but samples of many others:

"Do not divide Him, and do not place apart (ἰδικῶς) a man and the Word God; do not think the Emmanuel a twofold person (διπρόσωπον)." [196]—"We do not say that the Son begotten of the essence of God and the Father before all ages is other than he who, at the end of time, was made (γενόμενον) of a woman and was born under the law; there is but one, and He is the same both before and after the true union with the flesh." [197]—"We acknowledge but one Christ, one Lord and one

[194] *Epist.* IV, col. 45, 48; XVII, col. 117.

[195] *Anath.* III, col. 120; *De incarn. unigen.*, col. 1249. This explanation of ἕνωσις καθ' ὑπόστασιν and φυσική, far from opposing Cyril's explanation of these words in his apologies against Theodoret and the Orientals (col. 332, 400, 404, 405), agrees perfectly with his teaching.

[196] *De incarn. unigen.*, col. 1221; cf. *Anathem.* III, IV, col. 120; *Epist.* XVII, col. 116, etc.

[197] *De recta fide ad reg.*, II, 2, col. 1340.

Son, who is both God and man, and must be believed to be God and man. We defend always the absolutely indissoluble union, believing that the same is [both] the only Son and the first-born: the only Son, as Word of God the Father and emanating from His substance; the first-born, inasmuch as He has become man and is one among many brethren." [198]

This is also the place to recall the expressions *ἕνωσις καθ' ὑπόστασιν, φυσική, κατὰ φύσιν,* already mentioned, capped, as it were, by the well known formula: Jesus Christ is *μία φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη.*[199] That formula which, taking his terminology into account, is the best expression of his teaching, was strenuously maintained by the Patriarch of Alexandria. True, in the symbol of union he adopted, for the time being, the language of his opponents and spoke of two natures (*δύο φύσεις*).[200] He adopted it because, as he himself explains, he saw in the other parts of the symbol several qualifying statements that made it impossible to take those words as an assertion of two separate natures or two persons; but, personally, he always came back to his own favorite formula, in which he saw the most accurate expression of the mystery: "Christ is the one incarnate nature of the Word God." [201]

But, after all, why is it that in the union, the humanity is not a person? Cyril replies that the humanity does not exist apart (*ἰδικῶς*); it does not exist by itself, nor does it belong to itself, for it belongs to the Word, who has made

[198] *De incarn. unigen.*, col. 1208; *Quod B. Maria sit deipara*, 4, col. 260; *Apolog. contra orientales*, col. 328 B.

[199] *Adv. Nestor. blasph.*, II, col. 60, 61; *Epist.* XL, col. 193; XLVI, 1, 2, col. 240, 241, etc.

[200] Even then, it is not improbable that Cyril made use of the restriction *ἐν ἐννοίαις*, on which he insisted later on, when explaining this concession to his friends.

[201] Cf. also *Epist.* XL, col. 192, 193; XLV, col. 225, 228, 232; XLVI, 1, 2, col. 240, 241.

it His own. This is the concept of the ἰδιοποίησις, which St. Athanasius had already brought into notice and which his successor sets forth thus: "We say that the body has become the own (ἴδιον) body of the Word, and not of some man [existing] by himself and separately, and of a Christ and son other than the Word. Just as that body which belongs to each one of us is called our own body, so we must say the same of Christ who is one. For, even though [His body] is homogeneous and consubstantial with our bodies, (for it was born of a woman), [nevertheless we must] deem it and call it, as I have said, the own body of the Word." [202] More briefly: Ἴδιον δὲ σῶμα τὸ ἡμῶν εποιήσατο (ὁ Λόγος) καὶ προῆλθεν ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γυναικός.[203]

As has been justly remarked,[204] this is the way Cyril presents the idea of *enhypostasia*, which was developed later on by Leontius of Byzantium. By making the humanity which He assumes His own, the Divine Logos draws it into His own person, and inserts it therein, as it were.

From this conception of the union of the Word and the humanity in Jesus Christ, there results a whole series of conclusions, which the Patriarch of Alexandria distinctly realized and explicitly drew.

The first is the legitimacy of the *communicatio idiomatum, i.e.*, the necessity of ascribing to the person of the Word Incarnate the actions, passions, and properties both of the divinity and the humanity, and of ascribing to the divinity or the humanity taken *in concreto* (to God or to the man) the actions and passions of the other nature. St. Cyril often used the former expression and justified his doing so;[205]

[202] *Apolog. contra orientales*, col. 372, 373.

[203] *Epist.* IV, col. 48; cf. 45; and also: *Adv. Nestor. blasph.*, II, prooem., col. 64; cf. 60; *Epist.* I, col. 28; XXXIX, col. 180; XLV, col. 233, 236; XLVI, 1, col. 240; *De recta fide ad reg.*, II, 22, col. 1364.

[204] J. Lebon, *Le monophysisme sévérien*, p. 410 and foll.

[205] *De recta fide ad reg.*, II, 16, col. 1353; *Quod unus sit Christus*,

but he used the latter also. There has been, he goes on to say, as it were, a mixture of the properties of the divinity and humanity united, each one of them participating, in the union and through the union, in the properties of the other element: *ὥσπερ ἀλλήλοις ἀνακιρνὰς (ὁ Λόγος) τὰ τῶν φύσεων ἰδιώματα.*[206] "We must then proclaim that [the Word] has imparted to His own flesh the glory of the divine operation, at the same time that He has made what belongs to the flesh His own, and clothed His own person with it through the union of the economy."[207] Thus, the flesh becomes vivifying, like the Logos Himself, and is associated to the active mission of the Holy Ghost.[208] However, Cyril does not fail to remark that this way of speaking is legitimate only if we consider the divinity and the humanity *in the union;*[209] for the divinity itself did not suffer; the Word of God, as such, was not born of the Blessed Virgin; He was not seized nor bound nor wounded; nor did He die; during the Passion, He was just as impassible as the flame into which a red hot iron is plunged; the iron, indeed, suffers from the contact, but not the flame.[210]

A second consequence of the unity of person in Jesus Christ is that there is in Him but one Son, who, being identical with the Word, Son of God, is the true Son of God (*υἱὸν ἕνα καὶ φύσει*).[211] On the other hand, because He has

col. 1309; *Adv. Nestor. blasph.*, I, 6; II, 3; IV, 6, col. 44, 73 and foll., 200 and foll.; *Epist.* XL, col. 196; XLV, col. 232; XLVI, 3, col. 244. Cyril abides so strictly by this rule, that he never presents the humanity in Jesus Christ as the direct *subject* or *object* of His actions and sufferings. It is the Word who acts and suffers *σαρκί*.

[206] *De incarn. unigen.*, col. 1244.

[207] *De incarn. unigen.*, col. 1241. Cf. *Scholia de incarn. unigen.*, col. 1380.

[208] *De incarn. unigen.*, col. 1241.

[209] *Homil. paschal.* XVII, 2, col. 777.

[210] *Epist.* XLV, col. 236; IV, col. 45; *Adv. Nestor. blasph.*, V, 4, col. 232; *Quod unus sit Christus*, col. 1337, 1357.

[211] *Anathem.* V, col. 417.

appropriated all that belongs to His own body, that same Incarnate Word has become the true Son of Mary; Mary has brought forth a God; she is θεοτόκος. The reader will recall that it was from the controversy to which that expression gave rise that the whole Nestorian conflict originated. Both Cyrillians and Nestorians promptly realized the bearing of what seemed a mere logomachy. Cyril devoted to the defense of the θεοτόκος two whole treatises, the *Quod sancta Virgo Deipara sit et non Christipara,* and the *Quod beata Maria sit Deipara,* besides considerable portions of other works, for instance, the first book of the *Adversus Nestorii blasphemias,* and the first part of the *De recta fide ad reginas.*

A third consequence drawn by Cyril from his teaching is that in Jesus the man must not be adored in one act of adoration *together* with the Word (συμπροσκυνεῖσθαι), as though this adoration had two distinct terms, but must be adored as constituting with the Word the only term of the same act of adoration, since he is personally the Word incarnate: Ἡμεῖς δὲ μιᾷ προσκυνήσει τιμᾶν εἰθίσμεθα τὸν Ἐμμανουὴλ, οὐ διϊστάντες τοῦ Λόγου τὸ ἑνωθὲν αὐτῷ καθ' ὑπόστασιν σῶμα.[212]

Lastly, Jesus being one in person, though God and man, is the natural mediator between God and man: "[The Apostle] calls Him mediator of God and men, because He is one out of two substances (ὡς ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν οὐσιῶν ἕνα ὄντα) . . . He is, then, the mediator of God, because He is of the same substance as the Father; He is also the mediator of men, because He shares fully, though without sin, in the human nature." [213]

These are the main outlines of St. Cyril's conception of

[212] *Adv. Nestor. blasph.,* II, 10, col. 97; 13, col. 109, 112; IV, 6, col. 204; *De recta fide ad reg.,* I, 6, col. 1205; *Anathem.* VIII, col. 121.

[213] *Quod B. Maria sit deipara,* 12, col. 269; *De incarn. unigen.,* col. 245.

the unity of Christ and of the mystery of the Incarnation. We must concede, however, that our meager summary gives but a faint idea of the vehemence and power that fill the writings of the Patriarch of Alexandria. It cannot be denied that in his teaching the person of the Word holds the first place, and that His humanity seems to be relegated to the background and as it were sacrificed. But it is an exaggeration to assert — as has been done by some scholars (Dorner, Loofs, Harnack) — that in Cyril's system the humanity of Jesus Christ is not a genuine humanity, a compact and individual human substance, but merely the grouping of the essential properties of humanity, having the substance of the Word for their center and support.[214] That opinion, which rests on a misinterpretation of the word φύσις as used by St. Cyril, runs counter to the Patriarch's most explicit statements. He repeats again and again that there has been, in the Incarnation, σύνοδος πραγμάτων ἤγουν ὑποστάσεων,[215] and that the Son is one ἐκ δυοῖν πραγμάτοιν;[216] and then, addressing Theodoret, who had spoken of the form (μορφή) of God taking the form of a servant, he observes that these forms have not been united without their hypostases, δίχα τῶν ὑποστάσεων; else, there would be no true incarnation (ἵνα καὶ ὁ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως λόγος ἀληθῶς γενέσθαι πιστεύηται).[217]

But, some one may say, Cyril admits in Jesus Christ but one φύσις after the union. This is true, and consequently it is true also that, considering merely his words, St. Cyril is a Monophysite. The fact becomes still more significant, when we recall that the formula μία φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου

[214] In this view, there is no *enhypostasia* of the nature, but only an *insubstantiatio* of the human properties in the Word.

[215] *Apolog. contra Theodoret.*, col. 396 C.

[216] *De recta fide ad Theod.*, col. 1200 C.

[217] *Apol. contra Theodoret.*, col. 396 C, 401 A.

σεσαρκωμένη, which he ascribes to St. Athanasius,[218] really comes from Apollinaris and has, in the writings of the latter, a Monophysite meaning, at least in the sense that the Word which replaces the intelligent soul, forms but one nature with the body. Besides Cyril often made use of the comparison of soul and body to explain the union of the Word and the humanity.[219] No wonder, then, that the Monophysites of a later age appealed in support of their doctrine to the authority of the Patriarch of Alexandria. It is to be regretted that Alexandrians and Antiochians did not use the same terminology, and that Cyril did not steer clear of the equivocations of Apollinarianism. Convinced as he was that the δύο φύσεις of Nestorius signified really two persons, and that, in upholding the unity of φύσις, he was standing by the tradition of Athanasius and the popes, Cyril was justified in consistently maintaining his formula and sticking to it to the end, even though he was willing, now and then, to depart from it for the sake of peace. But, granting all that, it still remains a fact that St. Cyril really admitted in Jesus Christ — to use our present-day terminology — two complete natures, a divine and a human nature, coëxisting without any mixture and confusion in the personal unity of the Word.[220] If, then, the Patriarch of Alexandria can be charged with not using the formulas of Chalcedon, he cannot be accused of disagreeing with the Council in thought.[221] As we shall see later, this was also

[218] *De recta fide ad regin.*, I, 9, col. 1212; cf. *Epist.* XVII, col. 116; XLV, col. 232.

[219] *De incarn. unigen.*, col. 1224; *Quod unus sit Christus*, col. 1292; *Adv. Nestor. blasph.*, II, 12, col. 105, 108; *Epist.* XVII, col. 116; XLV, col. 233.

[220] The following text may be subjoined: Ἰησοῦν, *τὴν τῶν φύσεων εἰδότα διαφορὰν καὶ ἀσυγχύτους ἀλλήλαις αὐτὰς διατηροῦντα* (*In Lucam*, col. 484; *Fragm. in epist. ad Hebr.*, col. 1005 C). Some much clearer texts, quoted by Rehrmann, seem to me of doubtful authenticity.

[221] Harnack himself rightly distinguishes *real* from *nominal* Mono-

the case with the great leaders of Monophysitism who appealed to his authority. They, too, were Monophysites in language rather than in teaching; but, whilst he can allege in self-defense that he wrote before the definitions of Chalcedon, they cannot make the same plea. As regards the comparison of the union between body and soul, which Cyril cited to explain the union of the Word and the humanity, and which was so severely criticised by Nestorius, we must bear in mind that it is a mere comparison that had been used before, and that Cyril quoted it precisely because it marked off clearly both the intimate character of the union and the inconfusion of the constitutive elements.

Hence it would be a grave inaccuracy to call St. Cyril's teaching on the Incarnation Monophysitism. After these preliminary remarks, it remains for us to examine a few other questions raised by subsequent controversies.

Did St. Cyril admit one or two operations, one or two wills in Jesus Christ? Our readers may recall that later on the Monothelites appealed to the authority of the Patriarch of Alexandria, and even quoted some of his texts in support of their doctrine.[222] On the other hand, the orthodox theologians quoted other texts that said just the contrary.[223] How does the matter stand in reality?

First, we may observe that in St. Cyril's time the question just adverted to had not yet been raised and therefore did not attract his attention, the more so as it is rather complex and calls for distinctions that were made only afterwards.[224] St. John Damascene accurately distinguished between him

physitism (*Lehrb. der DG.*, 352 and foll.; English transl., vol. IV, p. 178).

[222] Mansi, X, 752; XI, 216, 525.

[223] Mansi, XI, 409–416, 417–420, 428–429.

[224] However, in connection with the Word, Pseudo-Basil seems to have distinguished between the ἐνεργήσας, the ἐνέργεια and the ἐνεργηθέν (*Adv. Eunomium*, IV, *P. G.*, XXIX, 689 C).

who acts and wills (ὁ ἐνεργῶν, ὁ θέλων), the power to act and will (ἡ ἐνεργετικὴ δύναμις, τὸ θελετικόν), the act itself of acting and willing (ἐνέργεια, θέλησις, τὸ ἐνεργεῖν, τὸ θέλειν) and the object of the action and will (τὸ ἐνεργητόν, τὸ θελητόν). Now, there is no doubt, on the one hand, that Cyril admitted in Jesus Christ the unity of the subject that acted and willed — since he acknowledged in Him only one person — and, on the other hand, admitted also that this one person wrought two kinds of works, divine and human, and acted θεϊκῶς ἅμα τε καὶ σωματικῶς.[225] Since the Patriarch of Alexandria taught that the Word assumed a complete humanity and a rational soul endowed with whatever belongs to it,[226] he evidently also admitted in the Incarnate Word a human faculty to act and to will freely, and consequently a human acting and willing. These thoughts seem to be expressed in several texts where Cyril speaks of the twofold operation of Christ (διπλὴν τὴν ἐνέργειαν), suffering as man and acting as God,[227] and where he contrasts, in connection with the agony at Gethsemane, the Savior's human will with the divine will, the μὴ θέλειν ἀποθανεῖν with the divine will.[228] However, even granting the correctness of this conclusion, it is quite possible that now and then Cyril took a simpler view of the subject and apparently favored the doctrine of only one operation in Christ. As a matter of fact, he anticipates at times the Severian theology, in which the ἐνέργεια is not distinguished from the hypostasis or person tending towards the term which it has in view, ὑπόστασις εἰς ἔργα κεκινημένη.[229] Under these conditions, there is but one ἐνέργεια in Jesus Christ, even though it is exercised sometimes through the

[225] *In Lucam*, col. 556 B.
[226] *De recta fide ad regin.*, II, col. 1413 B.
[227] *In Lucam*, col. 937 A, 865 B.
[228] *In Lucam*, col. 924 B; *In Matth.*, col. 456 C; *In Ioan.*, col. 532 B, 533 BD; *In psalm.* LXIX, col. 1169 B.
[229] *Adv. Nestor. blasph.*, IV, 2, col. 180 D.

divine nature only, and sometimes through the body. Thus we may explain the text objected to by the Monothelites, where Cyril, commenting upon the resurrection of the daughter of Jairus, speaks of the *μία ζωοποιὸς ἐνέργεια Χριστοῦ*, and says that Christ *μίαν τε καὶ συγγενῆ δὶ ἀμφοῖν ἐπιδείκνυσι τὴν ἐνέργειαν.*[230] These words refer to the vivifying power of the Word, which manifests itself by associating the flesh, as *συνεργάτην*, to its divine operation.

Contrary to our expectations, the Saint is no more explicit on the subject of Jesus Christ's human knowledge than the Greek Fathers who preceded him.

In the *Thesaurus*, assertion XXII,[231] he examines the text *De die et hora nemo scit* (*Matth.*, XXIV, 36; *Marc.*, XIII, 32). His answer is that Jesus Christ said that He was ignorant of the day of the judgment as a man, but not as the Word, and that in speaking thus, He acted in perfect harmony with the economy of the Incarnation. He gives almost the same answer to Theodoret, in connection with the same text, but observes that it is the same Incarnate Word who, as God, knows everything and, as man, seems not to know all things, because "undergoing the measure of our ignorant humanity, He has appropriated it with all the rest in the economy."[232]

His interpretation of the text *Quot panes habetis?* (*Marc.*, VI, 38; *Ioan.*, VI, 5, 6) is less explicit. Cyril merely says that, whilst Jesus Christ knew, as God, how it was, "as man, He might fail to know it, so as to be like His brethren in all things."[233] Lastly, the text of St. Luke (II, 52) about the growth of Jesus in wisdom, age and grace drew his attention.

[230] MANSI, X, 752; XI, 525.

[231] Col. 369, 372, 373, 376, etc. I omit what we read on the subject in the *Adversus anthropomorphitas*, XIV, for that work is of doubtful authenticity.

[232] *Apolog. contra Theodoret.*, col. 416.

[233] *Thesaurus*, assertio XXII, col. 377.

In the *Quod unus sit Christus,*[234] he touches lightly upon the subject; but in the *Thesaurus,* assertion XXVIII, he studies it carefully. First, he suggests that Jesus Christ grew as man; [235] then, withdrawing his statement, as it were, he assumes that our Lord's progress in wisdom and grace was only apparent, His wisdom and grace manifesting themselves gradually to those who saw Him: "*He advanced in wisdom and grace.* Do not think that there was in Him an increase of wisdom, for the Word of God lacks nothing; but, because, in the eyes of those who saw Him, He was always more and more pleasing and wise, it is said that He advanced, the progress being, as a matter of fact, more with those who admired Him, than in Him." [236]

This last conclusion, which he developed against Nestorius,[237] agrees better with the general tenor of his Christology. However, it is remarkable that, now and then, the great champion of Christ's unity thought it was in accord with the economy of the Incarnation that the humanity of Christ should share that ignorance which is the common lot of mankind.

To conclude: if we wish to form an accurate idea of St. Cyril's Christological teaching, we must not push to their extremes the verbal distinctions that were made after his day. Instead of building up Christ's unity artificially, as it were, like the Antiochians, the Patriarch of Alexandria grasps it directly, nay almost senses it, so to speak. His viewpoint is religious rather than metaphysical. Like St. Athanasius, he is engrossed with the idea of the redemption: No mere man was able to save us; the Word of God, God Himself, had to be born, suffer and die for us.

[234] Col. 1332.
[235] Col. 424, 425.
[236] Col. 428.
[237] *Adv. Nestor. blasph.,* III, 4, col. 153.

CHAPTER III

EUTYCHIANISM. DEFINITION OF THE DUALITY OF NATURES IN JESUS CHRIST

§ 1. Eutychianism up to the Latrocinium of Ephesus.

As we have seen, the treaty of peace concluded between St. Cyril and John of Antioch, in 433, had not given universal satisfaction. However, it afforded to the East some fifteen years of comparative religious tranquillity, during which most of those who had played a part in the affair of Nestorius passed away. In the year 444, Cyril died and was succeeded by Dioscorus, an ambitious, violent and quick-tempered man, whose only aim seems to have been to maintain the prećminent position of his see against Constantinople and Antioch. John of Antioch was replaced in 443 by his nephew Domnus, who had a weak and hesitating character. Flavian, who became patriarch of Constantinople in the year 447, was more favorably inclined than his predecessor Proclus towards the ideas of St. Cyril and steered a middle course, which was that of orthodoxy. Ibas had become bishop of Edessa in the year 435. Lastly, at Rome, St. Leo succeeded Xystus III on September 29, 440. The new Pontiff was a man made to rule and gifted with a perfectly balanced mind; he wished, above all, simple formulas and silence on those questions that were insoluble. As to Theodosius II and Theodoret, both of them, particularly the latter, were destined to witness the events that were forthcoming. Theodosius lived to 450, Theodoret to 457.

During St. Cyril's lifetime his authority seems to have suc-

ceeded in holding in check those of his adherents who entertained Monophysitic views. But as soon as Dioscorus came into power, vexations began against the former friends of Nestorius, Count Irenæus, who had meanwhile become bishop of Tyre, Theodoret,[1] and Ibas. This was but the prelude of another crisis, which broke out with Eutyches.

Eutyches was archimandrite (*i.e.*, superior) of a convent situated close to the walls of Constantinople, and which counted some three hundred monks. As obstinate as he was narrow-minded, this aged monk had labored zealously in behalf of St. Cyril's cause, and enjoyed considerable influence at court through his godson, the eunuch Chrysaphius, although he had been denounced as a heretic by the Bishop of Antioch.[2] What the result of that denunciation had been, we do not know; the intervention of Eusebius of Dorylæa was destined to have greater consequences.

On November 8, 448, in one of those special councils which the patriarch of Constantinople was wont to hold,[3] Eusebius produced a memoir, in which he charged Eutyches with slandering orthodox writers and holding heretical views himself.[4] Flavian was rather slow to admit the accusation; however, at Eusebius' entreaties, Eutyches was cited to appear, and meanwhile the bishops present proclaimed that Christ, after the Incarnation, is *of* two natures or *in* two natures, ἐκ δύο φύσεων, or ἐν δύο φύσεσι.[5]

[1] Cf. his letters LXXIX–LXXXIII.

[2] Facundus, *Pro defensione trium capitulorum*, VIII, 5; XII, 5.

[3] Σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα, a meeting, under the presidency of the patriarch, of the many bishops who used to come to Constantinople on personal or diocesan business.

[4] Mansi, VI, 652.

[5] Flavian says ἐκ δύο φύσεων ἐν μίᾳ ὑποστάσει καὶ ἑνὶ προσώπῳ; Basil of Seleucia and Seleucus of Amasia, ἐν δύο φύσεσι (Mansi, VI, 680, 685), and yet all three approve and praise St. Cyril's teaching. Flavian himself, in the profession of faith which he sent to the Emperor, adopts ἐν δύο φύσεσιν: however, he is willing, he says, to "speak of one only in-

Eutyches refused to appear, saying that he accepted the teaching of Nicæa and Ephesus, adoring, after the Incarnation, "only one nature, that of God incarnate and made man."[6] This was St. Cyril's expression. Meanwhile, however, it was proved that the Archimandrite had tried to have some Monophysitic formulas subscribed in convents, and several other doctrinal inaccuracies were charged against him in the sixth session. At last, in the seventh session, November 22, the Archimandrite, after having been cited three times, made up his mind to appear. He was closely examined and asked to answer these two questions: (1) Was Christ consubstantial with us? (2) Were there in Him two natures after the Incarnation? Eutyches gave evasive answers; but finally, in reply to the first question, declared that he had never said that Christ was consubstantial with us; that he had affirmed that the Blessed Virgin was consubstantial with us and that God had become incarnate from her; but that he had not affirmed that the body of our Lord and Savior was consubstantial with us: *τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ὁμοούσιον ἡμῖν.*[7] The second question he answered by saying that he confessed that Christ was of two natures before, but not after the union: *Ὁμολογῶ ἐκ δύο φύσεων γεγενῆται τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν πρὸ τῆς ἑνώσεως, μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἕνωσιν μίαν φύσιν ὁμολογῶ.*[8]

As he was willing to comply with the bishops' request to change his expressions, they asked him to condemn his errors. This he refused to do, under the pretext that he could not

carnate nature of the Word-God, because out of the two He is but one and the same Jesus Christ," *καὶ μίαν μὲν τοῦ θεοῦ Λόγου φύσιν σεσαρκωμένην μέντοι καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσασαν λέγειν οὐκ ἀρνούμεθα, διὰ τὸ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν* (*ibid.*, 540, 541). This enables us to judge of St. Cyril's influence as to the use of the word *φύσις*.

[6] Mansi, VI, 700.

[7] Mansi, VI, 741.

[8] Mansi, VI, 744.

condemn those Fathers whose teaching was identical with his. He quoted particularly the authority of St. Athanasius and St. Cyril against the duality of natures.[9] The Council was not satisfied with these partial concessions, but excommunicated the Archimandrite and deposed him from the government of his monastery and the exercise of the priesthood.[10] Thirty-two bishops, and later on twenty-three archimandrites, signed the decree of condemnation.

This was perhaps too rigorous a measure against an old man, whose guilt seems to have been extenuated by his ignorance. But we must bear in mind that the Council had been unfavorably impressed by Eutyches' proselytizing, and Flavian was probably not sorry to get rid of an overzealous partisan of the Patriarch of Alexandria. At all events, the main difficulty for us is to know precisely what was wrong in the Christological views of Eutyches, and what he meant by asserting that, unlike the Blessed Virgin, Christ was not consubstantial with us. In a profession of faith sent to St. Leo after the Council, Eutyches affirms that the Word was made flesh, "ex ipsa carne virginis incommutabiliter et inconvertibiliter, sicut ipse novit et voluit."[11] Whilst the last quoted words are rather vague, the first plainly oppose the idea that the Word was transformed into flesh and did not take His body from Mary; they even oppose the idea of a fusion of the Word and the flesh into a mixed nature, for such a fusion could not have taken place without some change in the nature of the Word. There, then, remains the idea of a deification of the body taken from Mary,— a deification that would have transformed it more or less into the nature of the Word. That this error was

[9] Mansi, VI, 745. This was the famous Apollinarian formula ascribed to St. Athanasius.

[10] Mansi, VI, 748.

[11] Mansi, V, 1016.

held by others in Eutyches' time, is true. Theodoret, in dialogue II (*Inconfusus*) of his *Eranistes,* written about the year 447, quotes the Monophysite interlocutor as explaining the unity of nature in Jesus Christ as follows: "I maintain that the Godhead has remained [what it was] and absorbed the humanity," somewhat as water dissolves and absorbs a drop of honey; not indeed, the heretic continues, because the humanity was annihilated in its union with the divinity, but because it was changed into it: *οὐκ ἀφανισμὸν τῆς ληφθείσης φύσεως λέγομεν, ἀλλὰ τὴν εἰς θεότητος οὐσίαν μεταβολήν.*[12] Eutyches may have entertained similar views.[13] Anyhow, we can readily understand that the rejection of the consubstantiality of the body of Jesus with ours left the field open to all kinds of suppositions, and that Theodoret had some reason for charging Eutyches with denying the incarnation *ex virgine,*[14] and St. Leo for suspecting him of Docetism.[15] For, if the humanity of Jesus Christ is not of the same nature as our humanity, is it a real humanity, and where does it come from?

Yet, as was to be expected, Eutyches did not accept his condemnation. Immediately after the session was over, according to the narrative of the deacon Constantine, he appealed to the council of the bishops of Rome, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Thessalonica,[16] had placards in his defense posted in Constantinople, and wrote to St. Leo,[17] St. Peter (Chrysologus) of Ravenna, and probably also to Dioscorus. The Patriarch of Alexandria was well disposed towards

[12] *P. G.*, LXXXIII, 153, 157 (*The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers,* 2d series, vol. III, p. 197).

[13] As we shall see, some of his disciples went much farther later on and taught a real transformation of the Word into flesh.

[14] *Haeret. fabul. compend.,* IV, 13.

[15] *Epist.* XXVIII, 2.

[16] Mansi, VI, 817.

[17] Cf. his letter in Mansi, V, 1014.

Eutyches, and before awaiting any other judgment on the case, and contrary to the canons, readmitted him to communion and restored him to his functions as a priest and archimandrite. But it was chiefly the Emperor Theodosius II whom Eutyches strove by all kinds of intrigues to induce to call another council to revise his trial. The Emperor acceded to his request, and, on March 30, 449, dispatched letters convoking a synod at Ephesus.

Meanwhile Flavian had informed the Pope of what had taken place at Constantinople, and, at his request, had submitted minute details to enable him to pass a well-grounded judgment on the whole transaction.[18] Leo felt sufficiently enlightened by the documents he had received from both parties, and on June 13, 449, handed to his legates who were leaving for Ephesus a series of letters containing firm and explicit declarations. One of these was the celebrated XXVIIIth letter to Flavian, which was afterwards accepted as a rule of faith by the Council of Chalcedon.

This letter [19] has always been regarded as a dogmatic document of exceptional value. Yet, it is decidedly inferior, in theological inspiration, to the works of Cyril, and strictly so-called speculation hardly finds any place in it at all. St. Leo does not discuss or demonstrate; he judges and settles difficulties. Whilst he merely reproduces the teaching of Tertullian and St. Augustine, and that of the Orientals, in as far as it is correct, he expresses it with uncommon terseness and vigor, and above all in terms that had been long forgotten in the West. His teaching may be summed up as follows:

(1) Jesus Christ is but one person: the Word and the

[18] Mansi, V, 1329, 1338, 1352.

[19] It is given in *P. L.*, LIV, 755; Mansi, V, 1366; Hahn, *Biblioth.*, § 224 (*The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 2d series, vol. XIV, pp. 254–258).

Christ are not two, but one and the same individual: "Qui manens in forma Dei fecit hominem, idem in forma servi factus est homo (3). . . . Unus enim idemque est, quod saepe dicendum est, vere Dei Filius et vere hominis filius (4)."

(2) In that one person there are two natures, the divine and the human, without confusion or mixture: "Salva igitur proprietate utriusque naturae et substantiae, et in unam coeunte personam, suscepta est a maiestate humilitas, a virtute infirmitas, ab aeternitate mortalitas. . . . Tenet enim sine defectu proprietatem suam utraque natura, et sicut formam servi Dei forma non adimit, ita formam Dei servi forma non minuit (3). . . . Quamvis enim in Domino Iesu Christo Dei et hominis una persona sit, aliud tamen est unde in utroque communis est contumelia, aliud unde communis est gloria (4)."

(3) Each one of these natures has its own faculties, its own operation, which it does not exercise independently of the other nature, nor apart from the union, which is permanent, and of which it is the immediate principle; this is the consequence of the duality of natures: "Agit enim utraque forma, cum alterius communione quod proprium est, Verbo scilicet operante quod Verbi est, et carne exsequente quod carnis est (4)." A whole chapter is devoted to the development of this idea.

(4) On the other hand, the unity of person entails a *communicatio idiomatum:* "Invisibilis in suis visibilis factus est in nostris; incomprehensibilis voluit comprehendi, etc. . . . (4). Propter hanc ergo unitatem personae in utraque natura intellegendam, et filius hominis legitur descendisse de caelo cum Filius Dei carnem de ea virgine, de qua est natus, assumpserit. Et rursus Filius Dei crucifixus dicitur ac sepultus, cum haec non in divinitate ipsa, qua Unigenitus consempiternus et consubstantialis est Patri sed in naturae

humanae sit infirmitate perpessus. Unde unigenitum Filium Dei crucifixum et sepultum omnes etiam in symbolo confitemur (5)."

This was the Christological doctrine which the Pope desired to have recognized at Ephesus and for the triumph of which he depended on three legates — Julian, bishop of Puzzuolo, Renatus, a priest, who died before the end of the journey, and Hilarius, a deacon. From some letters written a short time afterwards, it is easy to see that St. Leo did not put much faith in the council which was about to open.[20] The event showed that his fears were justified.

The council, which had been convoked for August 1, 449, was to be presided over by Dioscorus, assisted by Juvenalis of Jerusalem and Thalassius of Cæsarea (in Cappadocia). The bishops who had condemned Eutyches at Constantinople were to be denied the right to vote, since the question at issue was whether or not their sentence was to be upheld. Theodoret had been forbidden to attend. To revenge himself the Emperor insisted that the Archimandrite Barsumas of Syria, a Monophysite of the extremest type, should participate in the deliberations. Under these circumstances Eutyches and Dioscorus were sure to triumph.

Their triumph was more than complete; it was excessive. It is beyond our scope to relate the various details of that council, which St. Leo characterized by the historical name of *latrocinium*.[21]

[20] *Epist.* XXXVI and XXXVII. Theodoret had the same impression (*Epist.* XVI, CXII).

[21] A part of the acts of the *latrocinium* of Ephesus has been preserved (in Greek) in the acts of the Council of Chalcedon, where they were read (Mansi, VI). A Syriac recension has been found in a MS. of the 6th century, and published, with a translation, by P. Martin, *Les actes du brigandage d'Ephèse*, Paris, 1876, and by F. Perry, *The second synod of Ephesus*, Dartford, 1881. Cf. Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, II, 1. p. 555 and foll. (*History of the Church Councils*, vol. III, p. 241 and foll.).

The bishops who were present touched the question of dogma merely to approve the declarations of Eutyches and protest against the doctrine of the two natures. The Pope's directions were purposely ignored. Moreover, Eutyches was definitively restored to his functions; Flavian, Domnus of Antioch, Ibas, Theodoret, and Eusebius of Dorylæum, were deposed; the Patriarch of Constantinople was shamefully ill-treated; the bishops were forced to sign blank documents under threat of swords and staves. Such is the record of that assembly, one of the most disgraceful ever recorded in history, and that proved disastrous to the Greek Church. A hundred and thirty-five ecclesiastical dignitaries were forced to sanction, by their signatures, those violent proceedings which the Emperor sealed with his approval.[22] The Papal legates did not sign, and before making their escape received an appeal, on the part of Flavian and Eusebius, to the Pope.[23] Leo could not let injustice triumph.

§ 2. The Council of Chalcedon.

On September 29, 449, at Rome, St. Leo held a fairly well attended council, which condemned the proceedings at Ephesus, and, on October 13, sent to the Emperor two letters of protestation,[24] in which he asked that a general council be held in Italy. This request, though supported by the Emperor of the West, remained unheeded. But the Pope was cheered by a letter from Theodoret, appealing to him from the sentence of the *latrocinium*,[25] by another from

[22] Mansi, VII, 495 and foll.

[23] The text of the two appeals has been published by T. A. Lacey, *Appellatio Flaviani*, 1903.

[24] Cf. St. Leo's letters LV–LVIII and LXII–LXIV.

[25] Theodoret, *Epist.* CXIII. After expressly asserting the papal supremacy, Theodoret tells St. Leo of the joy he experienced in reading the letter to Flavian, and of the way he had been condemned by Dioscorus, before any citation and hearing. He appealed to the apos-

Pulcheria, expressing her utter dislike for Eutyches' teaching,[26] and by a third from Anatolius, the new Patriarch of Constantinople, announcing his election.[27] This last-mentioned step implied a desire on the part of Anatolius to come to an agreement, and profiting by it, St. Leo had already sent legates to Constantinople, when an event took place that put an end to the difficulties of the situation.

On July 28, 450, Theodosius II died without male issue. The imperial crown devolved on his sister, Pulcheria, who had been proclaimed *augusta* as early as 415 and become associated in the government of the empire. She offered her hand to a general, Marcian, who ascended the throne with her. Marcian and Pulcheria were favorable to Flavian and St. Leo. Thus the whole state of things suddenly changed. Chrysaphius was put to death for his crimes. In a synod held at Constantinople, probably in November, 450, Anatolius and his bishops condemned Eutyches and subscribed to Leo's letter to Flavian.[28] When he saw that matters were turning out well and that it was impossible to hold the desired council in Italy, the Pope expressed a wish that no council be held at all.[29] But Marcian was bent on having one. On May 17, 451, the council was convoked to Nicæa for the 1st of September. It opened October 8, at Chalcedon, whither it had become necessary to transfer

tolic see: "I await the sentence of your apostolic see. I beseech and implore your Holiness to succor me in my appeal to your fair and righteous tribunal. Bid me hasten to you and prove to you that my teaching conforms to that of the Apostles" (*P. G.*, LXXXIII, 1316, 1317).

[26] The Pope's answer alone is extant, *Epist.* LX.

[27] *Inter epist. S. Leonis, Epist.* LIII. Anatolius was an Alexandrian, the *apocrisiarius* of Dioscorus.

[28] This was one of the conditions laid down by St. Leo for the recognition of Anatolius as the legitimate patriarch of Constantinople (*Epist.* LXIX, July 10, 450).

[29] *Epist.* LXXXIII, June 9, 451.

it. From five to six hundred bishops gathered there.[30] Theodoret and Ibas were present; Domnus, the deposed patriarch of Antioch, did not come: he had not protested against the election of Maximus, who had been chosen to succeed him, and had retired into a monastery. Dioscorus had on his side only some fifteen or twenty Egyptians. A certain number of imperial commissioners had been entrusted with the maintenance of order and with the regulation of whatever pertained to the external management of the Council; but it was to be the legates' business to preside over the resolutions and definitions. These legates were Paschasinus, bishop of Lilybaeum, and the priest Boniface, both of whom came for the purpose, and Bishop Lucentius, who was already at Constantinople.[31] St. Leo formally claimed for Paschasinus the presidency of the Council (*vice mea synodo convenit praesidere*),[32] and we know that his wish was complied with.[33] Moreover, in the whole correspondence to which this affair gave rise, the Pope spoke as a master and with the full consciousness of authority. In his XCIIId letter to the Council, dated June 26, 451, he said that, as he was not able to attend the Council, he would preside over it through his legates (1), and forbade any discussion as to what had to be believed, since his letter to Flavian had made it sufficiently clear: "Non liceat defendi quod non licet credi, cum secundum evangelicas auctoritates, secundum propheticas voces apostolicamque doctrinam, plenissime et lucidissime, per litteras quas ad beatae memoriae Flavianum episcopum misimus, fuerit declaratum quae sit de sacramento incarnationis Domini nostri Iesu Christi pia et sincera confessio (2)."

[30] St. Leo, *Epist.* CII, 2.

[31] The priest Basil, who was also at Constantinople, did not show up at the Council, perhaps on account of sickness or death.

[32] *Epist.* LXXXIX, June 24, 451, to Marcian.

[33] Mansi, VI, 148; St. Leo, *Epist.* CIII.

The Council was held in the church of St. Euphemia. Its acts are still extant.[34] It is beyond our province to follow them up in detail. We shall confine ourselves to the dogmatic aspect.

The Council had to settle questions bearing on persons and on faith; and these two kinds of questions interpenetrated one another more or less. The former concerned what was to be done, on the one hand, with Dioscorus and his accomplices in the *latrocinium;* on the other, with the victims of that *latrocinium,* particularly Theodoret and Ibas. Although a few bishops raised their voices in his behalf and asked that he be forgiven, Dioscorus was deposed and his deposition signed by two hundred and ninety-four members of the Council.[35] The motives given were not directly doctrinal. He was charged with receiving into his communion and unlawfully restoring Eutyches, who had been legitimately condemned by Flavian; with refusing to have Leo's letter read at the *latrocinium;* with even excommunicating the Pope;[36] and transgressing the canons by refusing to answer the citations of the Council then in session; briefly, with being refractory and stubbornly perverse. Dioscorus emphatically asserted that his doctrine was none other than that of Cyril, and that, although he admitted but one φύσις after the union, he rejected absolutely any admixture and change of the united natures.[37]

Dioscorus' many accomplices were spared. They were

[34] Mansi, VI, VII. See also Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des Conciles,* II, 2 (*History of the Church Councils,* vol. III, book XI).

[35] Mansi, VI, 1048.

[36] That excommunication had been fulminated perhaps a short time before the opening of the Council of Chalcedon (Mansi, VI, 1010).

[37] Οὔτε σύγχυσιν λέγομεν, οὔτε τομὴν οὔτε τροπήν· ἀνάθεμα τῷ λέγοντι σύγχυσιν, ἢ τροπήν, ἢ ἀνάκρασιν (Mansi, VI, 676, 677). In fact, as we shall see later, Dioscorus was not an Eutychian and upheld Eutyches against Flavian merely for reasons of self-interest.

repentant and, besides, their cowardice at the *latrocinium* had some excuse. Theodoret, whom the Egyptians had first greeted with outbursts of fury, was, in the eighth session, declared orthodox and restored to his see; but he was required to anathematize Nestorius, which till then he had refused to do. He submitted rather grudgingly to this demand.[38] The case of Ibas was more complicated. Besides some misgivings about his faith, there were several charges regarding the administration of his diocese, charges that had been already examined in synods at Tyre and Beyrouth. Among the official records of the previous trials, there was a letter which Ibas had sent to Maris of Ardaschir, and which was condemned later on by the fifth general Council. The Fathers of Chalcedon held that the charges against Ibas were not proved, and that his letter to Maris rather proved his orthodoxy: "After the reading of the documents," the legates declared, "we have learned, from the sentence of the venerable bishops (Photius of Tyre and Eustathius of Beyrouth), that Ibas is innocent; for, upon his letter being read, we have seen that he is orthodox" (*ἀναγνωθείσης γὰρ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς αὐτοῦ, ἐπέγνωμεν αὐτὸν ὑπάρχειν ὀρθόδοξον*).[39] The Council accepted this conclusion and restored Ibas to his see; but he was required to anathematize Nestorius and Eutyches.[40]

[38] "Anathema to Nestorius and to everyone who does not call the holy Virgin Mary mother of God, and who divides the one Son, the only-begotten Son, into two Sons. I have subscribed the definition of faith and the letter of the most holy archbishop Leo, and thus I think: and now, fare ye well" (Mansi, VII, 189). In the same session, Sophronius of Constantia and John of Germanicia were also compelled to anathematize Nestorius.

[39] Mansi, VII, 261. Maximus of Antioch also defended the orthodoxy of the letter to Maris: *ὀρθόδοξος ὤφθη αὐτοῦ ἡ ὑπαγορία* (*ibid.*, 264). Eunomius of Nicomedia observed that Ibas had afterwards retracted what he had said of Cyril (*ibid.*, 266).

[40] Mansi, VII, 268, 269.

On the doctrinal question, which came up chiefly in the second, fourth and fifth sessions, the members of the Council were irresolute, and now and then gave signs of Monophysitic tendencies. Most of the Fathers were opposed to a new formula of faith, but wished merely to approve certain documents, the contents of which would express their own belief. In the second session, the following documents were publicly read and received with acclamation: The creed of Nicæa, that of Constantinople of the year 381,[41] the IVth letter of St. Cyril to Nestorius, his letter *Laetentur cæli* to John of Antioch, and the letter of Leo to Flavian (Peter has spoken through Leo).[42] That is all the legates demanded, and, as I have already observed, the Fathers would have gone no further, had not the Emperor been determined to have a formula whose acceptance or rejection would enable him to discern immediately the orthodox from the dissenters. At the beginning of the fifth session (October 22, 451), a new formula of faith that had been drawn up under the auspices of Anatolius was presented. Its text is lost. All we know for certain is that it asserted that Jesus Christ is of two natures, ἐκ δύο φύσεων.[43] The expression was accurate, but ambiguous and, in this particular case, unsatisfactory, since Dioscorus himself had declared that he held it: Τὸ ἐκ δύο φύσεων δέχομαι, τὸ δὲ δύο οὐ δέχομαι.[44] However, the formula was accepted by most members of the Council, excepting the papal legates and some Orientals, and there were outbursts in its behalf against the so-called

[41] This is the first time that creed is called thus. (Cfr. *Hist. of Dogm.*, vol. II, p. 64, foll.).

[42] Mansi, VI. 972. Regarding the letter of St. Leo, the bishops of Illyricum and Palestine raised some difficulties and doubts, that had to be answered in private conferences, and the imperial commissioners required that each bishop pronounce himself distinctly (Mansi, VI, 972, 973; VII, 9 and foll., 27, 32 and foll.).

[43] Mansi, VII, 104.

[44] Mansi, VII, 105.

Nestorians.[45] But the legates held out against the opposition, and with Marcian's support, declared that, unless a symbol of faith that perfectly agreed with St. Leo's letter, were adopted, they would leave and hold a council in the West. A commission was appointed and drew up another formulary, which was definitively received with acclamations by the assembly.

In this document the bishops expressed their acceptance — already stated in the second session — of the decisions and symbol of Nicæa, the symbol of Constantinople, the IVth and XXXIXth letters of St. Cyril and the letter of St. Leo to Flavian. The formal profession of faith ran as follows:[46]

"Following, then, the holy Fathers, we teach with one voice one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, perfect in His godhead, perfect in His manhood, true God and true man, [constituted] of a rational soul and a body, consubstantial with the Father in His godhead, and consubstantial with us in His manhood, like unto us in all things, sin only excepted; begotten of the Father before all ages in His godhead, and, in His manhood, born for us and for our salvation, in these last days, of the Virgin Mary, mother of God: one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, the only begotten Son, in two natures, unconfusedly, immutably, indivisibly, inseparably; for the union has not taken away the distinction of natures: each one of them has preserved its way of being and has been joined to the other in one person and hypostasis. [Likewise, Jesus Christ has not been] separated or divided into two persons, but there is but one and the same Son, the only begotten Son, God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ, as the prophets of old [have spoken], as the Lord

[45] Mansi, VII, 101.

[46] Mansi, VII, 116; Hahn, § 146 (*Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 2d series, vol. XIV, p. 264).

Jesus Christ Himself has taught us, and as the creed of the Fathers has delivered to us." [47]

This formulary had not the fulness of exposition peculiar to the Pope's letter and was less explicit as regards the activity proper to the two natures; but it did away with all ambiguity and gave satisfaction to the legates, who, as a matter of fact, had had a hand in its composition. It was subscribed to by three hundred and fifty-five bishops.

To these doctrinal decisions the Council added some disciplinary canons.[48] The most important, and the only one with which we are concerned here, is the XXVIIIth, which assigned second rank to the patriarch of Constantinople, next to the Pope, and placed under his authority the dioceses of Pontus, proconsular Asia and Thrace, whose metropolitans must henceforth be consecrated by him.[49]

After all this had been done, the Council wrote to the

[47] *Ἑπόμενοι τοίνυν τοῖς ἁγίοις πατράσιν ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμολογεῖν υἱὸν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν συμφώνως ἅπαντες ἐκδιδάσκομεν, τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν θεότητι καὶ τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι, θεὸν ἀληθῶς καὶ ἄνθρωπον ἀληθῶς τὸν αὐτόν, ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, καὶ ὁμοούσιον τὸν αὐτὸν ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον ἡμῖν χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας· πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου τῆς θεοτόκου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστόν, υἱόν, κύριον, μονογενῆ, ἐν δύο φύσεσιν ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀχωρίστως γνωριζόμενον· οὐδαμοῦ τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνῃρημένης διὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν, σωζομένης δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς ἰδιότητος τῆς ἑκατέρας φύσεως καὶ εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν συντρεχούσης, οὐκ εἰς δύο πρόσωπα μεριζόμενον ἢ διαιρούμενον, ἀλλ' ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν υἱὸν καὶ μονογενῆ, θεὸν λόγον, κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν· καθάπερ ἄνωθεν οἱ προφῆται περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐξεπαίδευσε καὶ τὸ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε σύμβολον.*— The reader will notice that the present text reads *ἐκ δύο φύσεων*, instead of *ἐν δύο φύσεσιν*. But the latter reading is surely the true one. Cf. Hahn, *loc. cit.*, p. 166, note 34; Hefele-Leclercq, II, 2, p. 723, note 1 (*Hist. of the Councils*, vol. III, p. 348).

[48] They are usually ascribed to the fifteenth session, although the precise time when they were voted is not known.

[49] Mansi, VII, 369.

Pope [50] to tell him of the work that had been accomplished, and to ask him to approve especially the XXVIIIth canon, against which the legate Lucentius had protested as contrary to the prescriptions of Nicæa and derogatory to the rights of the metropolitans.[51] The Pope delayed his answer for a while: he felt uneasy at some actions of Anatolius, and was resolved to reject the XXVIIIth canon. But, on learning that his silence was interpreted by the opponents of the Council as a condemnation of its decisions, he sent to the bishops who had attended it, the CXIVth letter, dated March 21, 453, in which he declares that he approves personally what the general Council — so he calls it — has decided "on the subject of faith only," explicitly repudiating whatever it might have decreed contrary to the regulations of Nicæa: "ut et fraterna universitas et omnium fidelium corda cognoscant me non solum per fratres qui vicem meam exsecuti sunt, sed etiam per approbationem gestorum synodalium, propriam vobiscum unisse sententiam: in sola videlicet causa fidei, quod saepe dicendum est, propter quam generale concilium, et ex praecepto christianorum principum, et ex consensu apostolicae sedis placuit congregari (1)."

Meanwhile the Emperor had enacted a series of decrees (February 7, March 13, July 6 and 28, 452),[52] to enforce the decisions of the Council. The last of these edicts commanded that the writings of Eutyches be destroyed, and threatened severe punishments against his followers.

With this the Council of Chalcedon came to an end. Many

[50] The letter is in Mansi, VI, 148, or *inter opera S. Leonis, Epist.* XCVIII. There has been much discussion as to whether or not the Council in that letter, and Anatolius and Marcian in their later letters, demanded of the Pope a strictly so called and subsequent confirmation of all the decisions of the synod. Hefele holds the affirmative; but see the note of D. Leclercq, *Hist. des conciles,* II, 2, p. 847, note 2.

[51] Mansi, VII, 453.

[52] Mansi, VII, 476, 477, 497, 501.

harsh things have been said of it; it has been charged especially with doing violence to the conscience of the Greek Church, which had a manifest liking for a Monophysite Christology, and thus bringing about the schismatic secession of Egypt. This is a reproach that can be made only by those for whom politics count more than truth. No doubt, the Council comprised many members who favored, not Eutychianism, but St. Cyril's concepts and formulas, and, as we have seen, this tendency was exhibited more than once. Above all, there were in attendance many bishops of inconsistent character and slavish disposition, whom Dioscorus' violent proceedings had intimidated and who tried to justify their weakness by doctrinal considerations. A strong will could easily influence such men who had no will of their own; hence it became possible for the legates, upheld as they were by the Emperor and a group of determined Orientals, to obtain from them the condemnation of Monophysitism, nay, the restoration of Theodoret and Ibas. As to the doctrinal formula adopted by the Council, it was excellent and proved serviceable in counterbalancing the decisions of Ephesus and the Cyrillian teaching; it saved the belief in an historical Christ, which was jeopardized by Eutyches' metaphysical reveries. Unfortunately, the work of doctrinal interpretation and adaptation was not pushed far enough, and no one was found to show that the decisions of Chalcedon in no way contradicted those of Ephesus or the teaching of St. Cyril, and in how far the terminology of the latter was defective, and how it ought to be understood so as to fit in with the new formulas. Substantial identity of doctrine was indeed affirmed, but not demonstrated.[53]

[53] However, an attempt at such a demonstration was made in the second session, when, with a view of settling the doubts of the bishops of Palestine and Illyricum regarding St. Leo's letter, several passages of St. Cyril were compared with that letter (Mansi, VI, 972, 973).

Hence, misunderstandings continued, and a considerable group of bishops persisted in believing that the Council of Ephesus had been condemned by that of Chalcedon, and St. Cyril's Christology rejected in St. Leo's letter. This was too much for men who were firmly set against Nestorianism and unwilling to receive, even apparently, any dictates from the West. Being called upon to choose, as they thought, between the Pope and St. Cyril, they preferred to stand firmly by the great Doctor of Alexandria.

§ 3. Theodoret's Christology.[54]

The decisions of Chalcedon marked the triumph of Western Christology, which was that of the moderate Antiochians. Among these scholars, there was one who, for twenty-five years, preëminently represented the school of Antioch. This was Theodoret. He was the intellectual leader of the party, and it is commonly believed that the formula of agreement of 433 was his work. Hence to set forth his Christology in detail would be, to a great extent, merely to repeat what has been said before in connection with Theodore of Mopsuestia, Nestorius, and the opposition raised by the followers of John of Antioch to St. Cyril's ideas. Theodoret's Christology may be summed up in a few pages.

Before the Incarnation there were not two natures, but only one; for the human nature was united as soon as it was conceived: the union was made ἐν τῇ συλλήψει.[55] But after the Incarnation, Christ is in two natures, ἡ λαβοῦσα καὶ ἡ ληφθεὶς φύσις.[56] The Bishop of Cyrus often distinguishes these natures in such a way as to speak of them as two

[54] On this particular part of Theodoret's teaching, cf. A. Bertram, *Theodoreti episc. Cyr. doctrina christologica,* Hildesiae, 1883. A. Ehrhard, *Die Cyrill von Al. zugeschriebene Schrift* Περὶ τοῦ Κυρίου ἐνανθρωπήσεως, *ein Werk Theodorets von Cyrus,* Tübingen, 1888.

[55] *Eranistes,* II, col. 144, 137, 140, 324.

[56] *Eranistes,* II, col. 109; *De incarn. Domini,* 24, 30.

persons: ἕτερος δὲ ὁ κατοικήσας κατὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς φύσεως, καὶ ἕτερος ὁ ναός.[57] It was not the Word God who was led into the desert to be tempted: it was the temple assumed by the Word God from the seed of David.[58] Besides, he identifies ὑπόστασις with φύσις and opposes both to πρόσωπον.[59] Each nature keeps in the union its properties and action: Ταῖς ἐνεργείαις μὲν διῃρημένας (φύσεις), τῷ προσώπῳ δὲ συννημένας — τάς τε τῶν φύσεων ἰδιότητας καὶ τοῦ προσώπου κηρύττει (ὁ Παῦλος) τὴν ἕνωσιν.[60] But, as we have just seen, there is between them συνάφεια, ἐνοίκησις, ἕνωσις. Theodoret well says that in this union, "all is a matter of good will, of love to man and of grace"; but he adds that this union is not merely moral, but physical: πλὴν καὶ φυσικῆς ἐνταῦθα τῆς ἑνώσεως οὔσης ἀκέραια μεμένηκε τὰ τῶν φύσεων ἴδια.[61] Thus there is in Jesus Christ only one person, one Son: ἓν μὲν πρόσωπον, καὶ ἕνα υἱὸν καὶ Χριστόν — ἕνα μὲν Χριστὸν ὁμολογοῦμεν . . . καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν διὰ ἕνωσιν θεόν τε καὶ ἄνθρωπον ὀνομάζομεν.[62] He who suffered was no other (ἄλλον τινά) than the Son of God.[63]

From this unity of person there follows the legitimacy of the *communicatio idiomatum*. Theodoret speaks of it in correct terms in his *Eranistes*,[64] though with some reserve. Whilst accepting the θεοτόκος, he does not reject the ἀνθρωποτόκος, which he thinks orthodox, provided it be correctly

[57] *De incarn. Dom.*, 18, col. 1452.

[58] *De incarn. Dom.*, 13, col. 1437; cf. 29, col. 1469; 21, col. 1457 (τίς ὁ λαβὼν κατὰ μέρος τὴν τελειότητα;); answer to the Xth anathematism, col. 437; *Fragments of sermons, P. G.*, LXXXIV, 62, 64.

[59] Answer to the IIId anathematism, col. 404.

[60] *De incarn. Dom.*, 21, 22, col. 1451, 1457, 1469; *Fragm., P. G.*, LXXXIV, 62.

[61] *Eranistes*, II, col. 145 (*Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 2d series, vol. III, p. 194).

[62] Answer to the IIId anathem., col. 404; to the IId, col. 400; to the VIIIth, col. 428, etc.

[63] *Eranistes*, II, col. 237.

[64] Col. 148, 240, 280.

understood.[65] But what he objected to most, was to speak of the suffering and death of God and the Word. He could not bear St. Cyril's XIIth anathema, and, in the *Eranistes,* derides the explanation according to which the Word suffered impassibly, ἔπαθεν ὁ Λόγος ἀπαθῶς.[66] In a fragment of the discourse which he pronounced at Antioch, A. D. 444, soon after the death of St. Cyril, he goes to the extreme of saying: "Nemo iam neminem cogit blasphemare. Ubi sunt dicentes quod Deus est qui crucifixus est? Non crucifigitur Deus. Homo crucifixus est Iesus Christus qui ex semine est Davidis, filius Abrahae. Homo est qui mortuus est Iesus Christus, etc." [67]

As regards the human knowledge of Christ, Theodoret admits that it was limited and that Christ, as man, was subject to ignorance. In the treatise *De incarnatione Domini* (20),[68] as well as in the *Pentalogus,*[69] he appeals to *Luke* II, 54, to prove that Jesus was true man and possessed a true human soul, for only a human soul, "which learns gradually the things divine and human," could grow in wisdom. In his answer to the IVth anathematism,[70] he draws the same conclusion from *Matthew* XXIV, 36, *"De die illo et hora nemo scit,"* etc. When He said this, Jesus admitted that He was ignorant of the day and the hour of the last judgment, because the human nature in Him did not know what had been revealed to it by the divine nature. This answer is in perfect agreement with the general trend of Theodoret's Christology.

[65] *De incarn. Dom.*, 35, col. 1477; answer to the Ist anathem., col. 393; *Fragm., P. G.,* LXXXIV, 62; *Epist.* CLI.

[66] *Eranistes,* III, col. 264 and foll.; cf. answer to the IVth anathem., col. 409, 412; *Fragm., P. G.,* LXXXIV, 639.

[67] *P. G.,* LXXXIV, 62.

[68] Col. 1453.

[69] Col. 68–73.

[70] Col. 411.

It has been asked whether the Bishop of Cyrus did not go beyond the limits of orthodoxy, and, granting that he was orthodox at the time of the Council of Chalcedon, whether he had been so from the beginning of the conflict, or rather had become so in consequence of the light that came to him from the controversy. We must not forget either his obstinacy in upholding Nestorius and Theodore of Mopsuestia, or the fact that he was condemned by the Vth General Council for his writings "against the right faith, and against the twelve chapters of the holy Cyril, and against the first synod of Ephesus, and also those which he wrote in defense of Theodore and Nestorius" (canon XIII).

Garnier has studied the question in his dissertations on Theodoret,[71] but he relies chiefly on the acts of his life and external testimonies. Although he does not pronounce definitively, his conclusions are rather unfavorable to the Bishop of Cyrus. A. Bertram, after a careful examination of the texts,[72] thinks that, at the beginning, the Bishop of Cyrus shared Nestorius' error, and threw it off only later, perhaps about the year 435. This conclusion may be accepted with some qualifications. No doubt, Theodoret approved the dyophysitism of Nestorius and himself at times employed inaccurate formulas and exaggerated expressions in stating his belief. Such formulas are found in great number in the treatise *De incarnatione Domini,*[73] which dates from the years 431–435, and in his answer to the anathematisms, which appeared probably in the year 430. They are very scarce in the *Eranistes,* which dates from about the year 447, and in the *Haereticarum fabularum compendium,* composed about the year 453; and altogether absent from the

[71] *Dissert.* III, cap. II, *P. G.,* LXXXIV, 401 and foll.

[72] *Op. sup. cit.*

[73] This treatise, which is found in the *Greek Patrology* among the works of St. Cyril (vol. LXXV), is really the work of Theodoret.

CLIst letter to the monks, which dates from 431, and is very carefully written. All these works, even the most defective, contain, side by side with reprehensible passages, others that are perfectly orthodox and state the dogma of the Incarnation forcibly and felicitously. Whilst, then, it can be justly said that Theodoret's Christological phraseology was at times inaccurate, it would be an exaggeration to question his belief, and to regard him, even at the beginning, as a conscious Nestorian, who admitted two persons in Jesus Christ. The Christology of the Bishop of Cyrus has the gaps and inconsequences that are common to the school to which he belonged. This explains why the Vth General Council condemned some of its details; but it must be admitted that his Christology asserts, or at least safeguards, the two fundamental truths defined at Ephesus and Chalcedon,— the unity of person and the duality of natures.[74]

[74] The IVth book, n. 12, of the *Haeretic. fabul. compend.*, and the *Libellus* to Sporacius (*P. G.*, LXXXIII, 1153 and foll.) contain a violent attack on Nestorius. But the question has been raised whether the *Libellus* is truly the work of Theodoret, and whether the work on heresies has not been interpolated.

CHAPTER IV

MONOPHYSITE OPPOSITION TO THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON TO THE END OF THE SIXTH CENTURY

§ 1. Chief Dates and Events.

The Council of Chalcedon had drawn up a doctrinal formula; but it had not effected a reunion of minds and hearts. No sooner had the bishops separated, than there arose a mighty opposition to their decisions.

Beginning with the year 451, until the end of the 6th century (when Monophysitism constituted itself definitively an independent Church, the Jacobite Church), the history of the main Oriental sees, excepting that of Constantinople, is a continued series of struggles between orthodox and heretics, of dispossessions followed by restorations, and of imperial interventions for the purpose of upholding or expelling this or that claimant, according as he complies with the monarch's religious policy or not. It would be both tedious and useless for our purpose to relate in detail all those vicissitudes. We shall note only the main dates and events.

The first period runs from 451 to 482, the date of Zeno's *Henoticon*. During that period, the orthodox party had to wage many a battle; but, owing to the support of the imperial power, it was able to hold its own and even to gain the upper hand. At one moment only, it is opposed by the emperor and the court. In the year 475, the usurper Basiliscus succeeds in deposing the Emperor Zeno, and, at the instigation of the Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria,

Timothy Ælurus, publishes, in the year 476, the *Encyclical*[1] (*τὸ ἐγκύκλιον*), which proclaims the first three general Councils the rule of faith, but rejects the General Council of Chalcedon as well as St. Leo's letter to Flavian, and incidentally condemns those who hold that Christ's body was merely apparitional or that it had come down from heaven. Basiliscus lasted only two years; Zeno reascended the throne in July, 477.

Meanwhile, the see of Antioch was occupied successively by Maximus (449–455), Basil (456–458), Acacius (458–459), Martyrius (460–470), Julian (471–476), John Codonatus (477), Stephen I (478–481) and Calandion (481–485). In 469 or 470, a skilful and ambitious monk, Peter the Fuller, by the support of the Apollinarians succeeds in having himself elected patriarch instead of Martyrius, and holds the see for a few months. Being forced by the decisions of a council to retire, he comes back for a short while in the year 475 or 476. We find him for the third time patriarch of Antioch from the year 485 to the year 488. No sooner had he become patriarch than he condemned the Council of Chalcedon; however, he is best known for adding to the trisagion several words that gave rise to many disputes. In the formula *ἅγιος ὁ θεός, ἅγιος ἰσχυρός, ἅγιος ἀθάνατος, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς*, he introduced the words *ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι' ἡμᾶς*. This expression could be justified only if the triple *ἅγιος* referred to Christ, and not to the Trinity, and it is probable that Peter understood it in that way.[2] Philoxenus and Severus explained it thus later on.[3] But at Constan-

[1] See the text in Evagrius, *Hist. eccles.*, III, 4 (*P. G.*, LXXXVI, 2, col. 2600 and foll.).

[2] Valois, *Observat. ad histor. eccles. Evagrii*, *P. G.*, LXXXVI, 2, col. 2894 and foll.

[3] Philoxenus, *Tractat. de trinitate et incarnatione*, edit. Vaschalde, translat., p. 39; Justinian, *Tract. adv. monophysitas*, *P. G.*, LXXXVI, 1, col. 1141 B.

tinople the three ἅγιος were referred to the Trinity, and therefore the Fuller's addition implied Patripassianism or Theopaschitism. Of course, this was a grave charge at the door of the Monophysites.

At Jerusalem, Juvenal, who had been ousted from his see for some time by the intruder Theodosius, was restored in 453, and succeeded by Anastasius in 458. Anastasius had to resign in connection with Basiliscus' *Encyclical* and was replaced by the Monophysite Gerontius (476); but when the storm was over, he reascended his see; Martyrius, who succeeded him, was patriarch from 478 to 486.

Egypt was the stronghold of Monophysitism, and it was there especially that, during this first period, orthodoxy had a hard struggle. The orthodox had chosen Proterius as successor to Dioscorus, in 452. A relentless opposition was raised against him by one of his priests, Timothy, surnamed Ælurus (ὁ αἴλουρος, *the cat*), and one of his deacons, Peter Mongus (μογγός, *the hoarse*). Proterius was assassinated in 457, and replaced by Timothy. One of the first acts of the new Patriarch was to declare himself against the Council of Chalcedon and to persecute the orthodox party. But sixteen hundred bishops (almost the whole Oriental episcopate)[4] disowned him; he was deposed, banished and replaced by Timothy Salofaciolus (*white turban*); but, under Basiliscus (475), he reascended the patriarchal throne and died in the year 477. His friend, Peter Mongus, succeeded him, but after thirty-six days was obliged to flee. Timothy was restored and held his see till his death (482).

[4] The attitude of the Pamphylian bishops was peculiar. They suggested that the formula of Nicæa be strictly adhered to, and asserted that, although they had accepted it, St. Leo's letter was neither a symbol nor a definition of faith, that it was binding only upon the clergy, and that it did not matter whether one said two inconfused natures, or *ex duabus naturis* or *una natura Verbi incarnata*, though this last formula was preferable (Mansi, VII, 573 and foll.).

Thus, in 482, the three patriarchal sees of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria, were still in the hands of the orthodox. As to that of Constantinople, it had been spared all these vicissitudes. There three patriarchs, Anatolius (449–458), Gennadius (458–471), and Acacius (471–489) had tranquilly succeeded one another. Acacius even resisted Basiliscus' caprices without being greatly molested.

Strangely enough, it was Acacius who caused the disturbances and schism that were to desolate the Greek Church during the second period (482–519) of the epoch we are now considering. Wounded in his self-love by John Talaia, the successor of Timothy Salofaciolus at Alexandria, and deceived by Peter Mongus, he incited the Emperor Zeno to publish an edict of union, addressed to the bishops, clerics, monks and people of Egypt, Libya and Pentapolis. This is the famous *Henoticon* (ἑνωτικόν), of 482, destined, in the Emperor's mind, to facilitate the return of the Monophysite dissenters to the Church. There is reason to think that this edict was framed by Acacius himself. Its text has been preserved by Evagrius.[5] It retained the symbol of Nicæa, as confirmed at Constantinople in 381, as the only symbol properly so called, but it added thereto the decisions of Ephesus of the year 431 and St. Cyril's anathematisms. Nestorius and Eutyches were condemned; the unity of Jesus Christ, consubstantial with God through His divinity, and consubstantial with man through His humanity, was strongly asserted. The views of those who divide (διαροῦντας), those who confound (συγχέοντας), and of the phantasiasts (φαντασίαν εἰσάγοντας) were rejected; anathema was pronounced against those who still believed the contrary, or had believed the contrary, *either at Chalcedon,* or anywhere else. Nothing was said of the two natures. Taking merely the words, the *Henoticon* contained nothing heterodox; but it did amount

[5] *Hist. eccles.,* III, 14.

to a rejection of the Council of Chalcedon. This latter feature was emphasized by the addition of a few perfidious words. In his attempt to draw up a formula that was loose enough to satisfy everybody, Zeno followed in the footsteps of the Eusebians after the Council of Nicæa. As might have been expected, that formula pleased nobody, but placed a very dangerous weapon in the hands of the politicians and religious fanatics. Peter Mongus subscribed to the *Henoticon* and was installed as patriarch of Alexandria, instead of Talaia, (October 482).[6] Acacius of Constantinople and Martyrius of Jerusalem received him into their communion; but Calandion of Antioch refused to recognize him, and, on Talaia's appealing to Rome, Popes Simplicius and Felix III successively declared themselves against the intruder. A council held at Rome in the year 484, deposed and anathematized Peter Mongus. Acacius was pronounced guilty, excommunicated and deposed by Felix III.[7] A certain number of monks, called *acœmetæ,*[8] hastened to convey this sentence to the Patriarch of Constantinople. The latter refused to submit and ordered the Pope's name to be expunged from the dyptics. This meant a schism (484).

The schism lasted thirty-five years and separated from Rome not only Constantinople, but the whole Greek Church, whose main sees were occupied by men who had signed the *Henoticon.*[9] This does not mean that all those bishops were

[6] Peter was able to win over to his side most of the orthodox; but many uncompromising Monophysites did not forgive him his comparatively moderate attitude towards the Council of Chalcedon and, seceding from him, formed the party of the Acephali (ἀκέφαλοι).

[7] Cf. Evagrius, *Hist. eccles.,* III, 21; St. Felix, *Epist.* VI, IX, X (*P. L.,* LVIII, 921, 934, 936; Mansi, VII, 1051, 1065, 1067).

[8] Ἀκοίμηται, *who do not sleep.* As we shall see later, these were over-fervent Chalcedonians.

[9] We may mention, among them, especially Peter Fuller (485–488), who, when made patriarch of Antioch for the third time, appointed to the see of Mabboug the well-known Philoxenus (485, † about 523),

Antichalcedonians and Monophysites. The decrees of Chalcedon, up to 509, were generally respected, except in Egypt. Efforts were even made at Constantinople by the patriarchs Fravitta (489–490), Euphemius (490–496), and Macedonius II (496–511), to be readmitted to communion with Rome. But the Popes demanded that the name of Acacius be struck off the dyptics, which, it seems, could not be done. Towards A. D. 509, the state of affairs began to grow worse. The Emperor Anastasius, who had frankly espoused Monophysitism, showed himself more and more exacting. At Constantinople, Macedonius had to resign in behalf of Timothy (511–518), who condemned the Council of Chalcedon. At Antioch, Flavian (498–512) had to make room for the famous Severus (512–518), a thorough-going Monophysite. For his unwillingness to acknowledge Severus, Elias of Jerusalem was exiled and replaced by John (516–524), who did not, however, comply with his promise to anathematize the Council of 451. Egypt was almost completely lost to the cause of orthodoxy since the rule of Peter Mongus (482–490). The bishops who succeeded him at Alexandria, Athanasius II (490–496), John II (496–505), and John III (505–515 or 516), declared themselves against the decisions of Chalcedon, without, however, succeeding in the attempt to win over the Acephali.

This was a trying situation for the Dyophysites. It came to an end with the death of the Emperor in 518. His successor, Justin I, was a determined Chalcedonian. Things were immediately reversed; relations were resumed with the Pope. Hormisdas sent five legates, who brought a formula to be signed by John II of Constantinople and the Oriental bishops.[10] After asserting the primacy of the Roman

who, like Severus, was one of the best theologians of the Monophysite party.

[10] Text in *P. L.*, LXIII, 443.

Church and her constant fidelity to the true faith (*quia in sede apostolica immaculata est semper servata religio*), this formula anathematized Nestorius, Eutyches, Dioscorus, Timothy Ælurus, Peter Mongus, Acacius, and Peter the Fuller. It reiterated the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon and all the letters of St. Leo on subjects of faith. It declared that the Apostolic See, in which religion remains ever intact and solid (*sequentes in omnibus apostolicam sedem, et praedicantes eius omnia constituta in qua est integra et verax christianae religionis soliditas*), must be followed in all things; and exacted a promise to expunge from the dyptichs the names of those who had departed from the communion of the Church, *i.e.*, the Apostolic See (*sequestratos a communione Ecclesiae catholicae, id est non consentientes sedi apostolicae*).

It was an unpleasant duty for a patriarch of Constantinople to affix his signature to such a declaration. Yet, John II did sign the papal document, though he tried to minimize his submission by explanations of his own invention.[11] The bishops present in the imperial city followed suit. Severus of Antioch, who managed to escape to Alexandria, was replaced by Paul II (519–521). Philoxenus was sent into exile. John was allowed to stay at Jerusalem. But nothing could be done in Egypt. Thus it was that, in the year 519, this first schism, the prelude of others far more enduring, came to an end.

The reigns of Justin I (518–527) and of his successors, Justinian (527–565), Justin II (565–578), Tiberius II (578–582) and Maurice (582–602), marked a period of official triumph for Chalcedonian orthodoxy, although, as we shall see later, it was disturbed, now and then, by Justinian's

[11] *P. L.*, LXIII, 443 and foll.; cf. 447. One of the best things — in his judgment — he said, was that the Church of the old Rome and that of the new constituted but one Church.

theological whims and fancies, and Theodora's intrigues. Notorious Monophysites were kept out of the main sees, and even at Alexandria a Catholic patriarch was installed against the heretical patriarch or patriarchs supported by the dissenters. Nay, at one time, about the year 548, it looked as though the Monophysite hierarchy was about to disappear, because of the severe measures Justinian had enacted to prevent suspect bishops from performing ordinations. A monk, who had been ordained bishop of Edessa in the year 543, James Baradai, for thirty-five years went all over the East, spurring on the members of the sect, consecrating bishops, and reorganizing the communities everywhere. When he died, in the year 578, there existed all through the empire a Monophysite Church, independent of the official Church, and possessing, for instance at Antioch, its own leaders. It was strong especially in three centers, Egypt, Mesopotamian Syria, and Armenia. This is the so-called Jacobite Church. It was far from being perfectly united, as we shall see, and was torn by many schisms and doctrinal dissensions. But it continued for many years to play an important part in the empire, resisting all advances and persecutions and producing literary, theological, and historical works of the greatest interest to us.

§ 2. Doctrinal Evolution of Monophysitism. Eutychian Monophysitism.[12]

The name of Monophysites is given to all those who rejected the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon and opposed the formula asserting two natures in Christ after the union, under the pretext that it was merely a form of revived Nestorianism.[13] Monophysites stand against Dy-

[12] Cf. on this section, J. Lebon, *Le monophysisme sévérien*, Louvain, 1909.

[13] The word Monophysite must be explained in relation to the decision of the Council of Chalcedon, rather than in view of the doctrine

ophysites, whom they confound with the Nestorians. But all those to whom the former appellation is applied and who profess only one nature in Jesus Christ, were far from understanding that teaching in the same way, and Monophysitism was far from being one definite teaching. Although we can not enter into a complete history of the various Monophysite sects,[14] we will briefly review the chief ones with the various tendencies that originated and developed in their midst.

In view of these tendencies we can divide the Monophysites into two great classes. Some, closely related to Eutyches, emphasize more and more the idea of the unity of nature in Jesus Christ, and tend to confuse the Savior's divinity with His humanity. These are the *real* Monophysites. Others, abiding by St. Cyril's teaching, assert with him that Christ is only one nature; but they do not identify and confuse His humanity and divinity, nor their respective properties: where the Nestorians separate and the Eutychians confuse, they pretend to distinguish. At bottom, they profess the doctrine of the Council of Chalcedon, but reject its terminology and formulas; they are Monophysites in *expression* and *language* only.

Eutyches' characteristic error consisted, as we have shown, in asserting that the flesh of our Savior was not consubstantial with ours. This error was also held by others.

which it implies. Let us merely observe that the writers of the 5th and 6th centuries often designate the Monophysites generally by names that originally applied only to some branch of the party; such, for instance, are the names *Acephali, Eutychians;* such also those of *Egyptians* and *Schematics,* used by St. John Damascene. The treatise *De sectis* often calls them *hesitating, separated* (οἱ διακρινόμενοι); this is an appellation which the Monophysites themselves assumed, in order to show their estrangement from the Council of Chalcedon.

[14] Such a history has not yet been written and cannot be written, till many documents that still lie buried in libraries are brought to light and edited.

There are still extant[15] two letters of Timothy Ælurus charging Isaias, a bishop of Hermopolis, and Theophilus, a priest of Alexandria, with holding this error. But the error could not stop within these limits, and, as Eutyches had not said why and how the body of Jesus Christ was not of the same nature as ours, his fundamental assertion necessarily called for explanation. The explanation recorded by Theodoret in the *Eranistes* has been already noticed. As early as the year 447, some Monophysites admitted a sort of absorption of Christ's humanity by His divinity: *ἐγὼ τὴν θεότητα λέγω μεμενηκέναι, καταποθῆναι δὲ ὑπὸ ταύτης τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα.*[16] Others claimed the Word had been transformed into the flesh. If the Word had taken flesh from Mary, they said, something would have been added to His person, and therefore to the Trinity; hence He took nothing from the Blessed Virgin: "Verbum nihil de Virgine sumpsit, sed ipsum, sicut voluit, in ea formatum est et factum est caro."[17] The Word had been condensed, as it were, into flesh, much the same as damp air becomes condensed into rain or snow, or water solidifies into ice.[18] Others went still further and regarded the Savior's humanity as a mere modification, an external appearance, taken on by the Logos and existing in His person, like the impress of a seal on wax.[19] This was a very close approach to Docetism, and we can hardly wonder at the name *Phantasiasts* given by Severus and Philoxenus to the authors of those reveries.

[15] Cf. Lebon, *Le monophysisme sévérien*, p. 96 and foll.; 489.

[16] *P. G.*, LXXXIII, 153.

[17] Cf. Philoxenus, *Tract. de Trinit. et incarnat.*, edit. Vaschalde, Rome, 1907, p. 151, 152.

[18] Cf. Pseudo-Zachary the Rhetor and Severus of Antioch, in Lebon, *op. cit.*, pp. 495, 496. This view is noticed by Nestorius, *Le livre d'Héraclide*, p. 9 (n. 11) and 12, 13 (n. 18).

[19] Cf. Pseudo-Zachary, in Lebon, p. 496.

The concept of a fusion or mixture of the two natures into one,— a notion condemned by both Apollinaris and Cyril — also found adherents. There exists a whole series of letters sent by Severus of Antioch to a certain Sergius, called the Grammarian, who held this view.[20] The distinction of properties in Christ, he said, implied Nestorianism: nothing but *μία οὐσία καὶ ποιότης* could be admitted.

Those who held such errors may have been many, but, unlike the *Aphthardocetæ,* they never posed as a party. The origin of the Aphthardocetæ is well known.[21] Severus of Antioch and Julian of Halicarnassus in Caria having fled to Egypt when Justin I became emperor, a controversy arose between them as to what was to be thought of the corruptibility of Christ's body. We must notice that this word meant, not only a tendency to decomposition, but, in a more general sense, passibility, *i.e.,* capability of suffering pain and even natural needs, such as hunger and thirst, and of experiencing the impulse of honest passions (*πάθη ἀδιάβλητα*), such as fear, joy, etc. Severus declared himself in favor of the theory of the corruptibility; whereas Julian upheld that of the incorruptibility of the Savior's body. As a consequence of its union with Christ, he said, and from the first moment of that union, Christ's humanity had been raised

[20] Lebon, *op. cit.,* p. 163 and foll., 538 and foll. Cf. also Eustathius, *De duabus naturis, P. G.,* LXXXVI, 1, col. 909 A. The controversy began about the year 515.

[21] Cf. Liberatus, *Breviarium,* 19 (*P. L.,* LXVIII); Pseudo-Zachary, *Hist. eccles.,* IX, 12; Leontius of Byzantium, *Contra nestorianos et eutychianos,* II (*P. G.,* LXXXVI, 1); *De sectis,* actio V, 3; actio X (*ibid.*). On the writings of Severus in this connection, see a note of Lebon, *op. cit.,* p. 173 and foll. Cf. Junglas, *Leontius von Byzanz,* pp. 100–105; J. C. L. Gieseler, *Commentatio qua monophysitarum . . . errores . . . illustrantur,* pars II, Göttingen, 1838. It is worthy of notice that the Aphthardocetæ started from a Soteriological point of view. The humanity of Jesus Christ, which was in principle similar to ours, could not be corruptible, else how could it save a corruptible nature?

above the laws to which our humanity is subject and had received properties different from those which befit ours. It was absolutely and radically incorruptible; there was in it οὔτε τροπή, οὔτε διαίρεσις, οὔτε ἀλλοίωσις, οὔτε προβολή, οὔτε μεταβολή. It is through an error of the senses that all those changes are ascribed to the body of Christ. Julian and his followers were called *Aphthartodocetæ* (ἀφθαρτοδοκῆται), or, in the words of Severus, *Phantasiasts,* or *Julianists* and *Gaianites,* after a certain Gaianos, who was their bishop at Alexandria. In their turn, they styled their opponents *Phthartolatræ* or *Corrupticolæ.* In a modified form their system found defenders even in several orthodox communities. Leontius of Byzantium applies the name Aphthardocetae to some who claimed that Christ's humanity was corruptible *de jure* but not *de facto.* Since Christ's humanity, they said, was innocent, born of a virgin and united to the Word, it must have been like that of Adam before the fall and such as ours shall be after the glorious resurrection, *i.e.,* by nature impassible and immortal (ἀπαθὲς καὶ ἄφθαρτον). Christ, then, suffered, not through a necessity of His nature (ἀναγκῇ φύσεως), but by divine decree; not because the condition of His body demanded it (σώματος φύσει), but because He so willed (θελήσει θεότητος); in fact, His sufferings were miracles (θαύματος λόγῳ).[22] It was this teaching, though somewhat extenuated, which Justinian embraced towards the end of his life (about 565); the Emperor even enacted in its behalf a decree whereby all bishops were commanded to teach it.[23] But he died before it could be carried out. The priest Timothy of Constantinople, who wrote a work, *De receptione hæreticorum,* at the beginning of the 7th century, speaks of the Julianists or Gaianites,[23a] and assigns

[22] Leontius of Byzantium, *loc. cit.,* col. 1329, 1333, 1340.
[23] Evagrius, *Hist. eccles.,* IV, 39.
[23a] *P. G.,* LXXXVI, 1, col. 44.

to their group the *Actistetæ,* who, however, are more akin to the Eutychians, inasmuch as they explained the origin of the Savior's body by a transformation of the substance of the Word. The Actistetæ pushed the *communicatio idiomatum* or rather the *identitas idiomatum* to the extreme and asserted that, like His divinity, the body of Jesus Christ was uncreated. Hence the nickname of ἀκτιστῆται or ἀκτιστίται. They revenged themselves by calling their opponents *Christolatri.*

There was but one step more to be taken in the Monophysite direction, *viz.* to identify the two natures after the union and deny all difference between them. This was done by an Alexandrian sophist, Stephen Niobe (about 570), who maintained that to distinguish or differentiate the humanity from the divinity after the union of the two natures in Christ, was pure Nestorianism: οὐδὲ τὴν διαφορὰν τῶν φύσεων μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν σώζεσθαι ἀνέχονται εἰπεῖν, in the words of the priest Timothy.[24] Even though he was condemned by the Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria, Niobe succeeded in making a certain number of converts, who preached his errors in the neighborhood of Antioch. A council held in that city by Peter of Callinicum (578–591) condemned him.

§ 3. Severian Monophysitism.

Eutychian Monophysitism, represented by the sects we have just named, pushed to the extreme the principle of the unity of nature in Jesus Christ. But the ablest minds and the chief leaders of the heresy are to be sought elsewhere. By the side of that Monophysitism which tended to mysticism, there grew up another, of a calmer and more argumentative type. Its most illustrious representative is Severus of Antioch, and hence it has been called Severian Monophysitism. Before Severus, and during his lifetime, it had among

[24] *De recept. haeret.,* col. 65.

its defenders such illustrious men as Dioscorus, Timothy Ælurus, Philoxenus, Theodosius of Alexandria, John of Tella, James of Saroug, and others. All claimed to follow St. Cyril's tradition. We shall presently examine their views and study them, as expounded by Severus, who developed them most fully.[25]

Severus' teaching has been censured as very obscure and contradictory; he himself has been accused of being an inconstant and fluctuating sophist.[26] This is owing to the

[25] Sources. (1) Such fragments as remain of the writings of Severus; much of it has never been edited; the following have been published: L. W. Brooks, *The Sixth Book of the select Letters of Severus, patr. of Antioch,* London, 1902–1904. R. Duval, *Les Homiliae cathedrales de Sévère d'Antioche, trad. inédite de Jacques d'Edesse,* I, Homélies LII à LVII, Paris, 1906, in the *Patrologia orientalis* of R. Graffin and F. Nau, tom. IV. E. W. Brooks, *The Hymns of Severus of Antioch, ibid.,* tom. VI et VII, 1911. A. Kugener, *Allocution prononcée par Sévère après son élévation sur le trône patriarcal d'Antioche,* 1902. Important fragments are also found in *Quaestiones adversus monophysitas* (*P. G.*, LXXXVI, 2, col. 1769–1901); Eustathius monachus, *Epistula ad Timothaeum scolast. de duabus naturis adv. Severum* (*Ib.*, I, col. 901–942); F. Diekamp, *Doctrina Patrum de incarn. Verbi,* Münster in W., 1907. Cf. also Mai, *Classici auctores,* Romae, 1828–1838; *Spicilegium romanum,* Romae, 1839–1844; J. C. L. Gieseler, *Commentatio qua monophys. . . . errores . . . illustrantur,* pars II, Göttingen, 1838. J. B. Chabot, *Documenta ad origines monophysitarum illustrandas,* Paris, 1908. In his *Monophysisme sévérien,* Lebon has briefly analyzed the IIId book of Severus' *Contra Grammaticum* (pp. 527–551), published several other fragments, and translated a few unpublished passages. (2) The ancient historians who wrote about Severus and Monophysitism, particularly: K. Ahrens and G. Krueger, *Die sogenannte Kirchengeschichte des Zacharias Rhetor,* Leipzig, 1899. J.-B. Chabot, *Chronique de Michel le Syrien,* Paris, 1901, 1902. A. Kugener, *Vie de Sévère par Zacharie le Scolastique. Vie de Sévère par Jean de Beith-Aphtonia,* Paris, 1903, 1904 (*Patr. orient.*, tom. II). E. J. Goodspeed, *The Conflict of Severus, patr. of Antioch, by Athanasius* (*ibid.*, tom. IV, 1908).— Works: F. Loofs, *Leontius von Byzanz,* Leipzig, 1887. J. P. Junglas, *Leontius von Byzanz,* Paderborn, 1908. M. Peisker, *Severus von Antiochien,* Halle, 1903. J. Lebon, *Le Monophysisme sévérien,* Louvain, 1909.

[26] Πολύμορφος, μυριόμορφος Σευῆρος, πολυποίκιλος σοφία (Eustathius, *op. cit.*, col. 913, 917, 929).

fact that many scholars have failed to understand his terminology and to penetrate his thought, which, though at times subtle and complex, is not entirely inconsistent.

Severus takes the three words φύσις, ὑπόστασις, πρόσωπον in absolutely the same sense. That he identifies the first two words, can be seen on every page of his writings; moreover, he uses the third in the same sense [27] in such passages as this: "When the hypostatic union, which is made up of two [natures], is confessed," he says, "there is but one Christ, without mixture, one person, one hypostasis, one nature, that of the Word incarnate." [28] On the contrary, if we logically separate Christ into two natures, we have not only two natures, but also two hypostases and two persons.[29] He understands these three words, even φύσις, in the sense of a concrete individual, a subject, a person. Φύσις is by no means the equivalent of οὐσία; it is opposed to οὐσία, as an individual to the genus.[30] Jesus Christ *has* not one nature only, He *is* one nature only.[31] To assert with the Chalcedonians that there are two natures in Him, is Nestorianism, for it is tantamount to asserting that there are two persons in Him; [32] number implies separation, and two natures are necessarily two persons.[33] As to the expression "two united

[27] Though quite seldom. Thus, notwithstanding the assertion of Eustathius (*op. cit.*, col. 921 A), it is doubtful whether Severus accepted the formula ἐκ δύο προσώπων, though he made no difficulty to accept the formula ἐκ δύο ὑποστάσεων; the former smacked too much of Nestorianism.

[28] *Letter to Sergius*, ap. LEBON, p. 243; cf. ANASTASIUS SINAITA, *Hodegos*, col. 148, 304. As Lebon has used the texts which I quote in his thesis and several of them are found nowhere else, I have pointed out the pages of his book where they can be read.

[29] EUSTATHIUS, col. 908 A; LEBON, p. 247.

[30] EUSTATHIUS, col. 920 D; LEBON, p. 257.

[31] EUSTATHIUS, col. 908 D, 909 D, 912 A; LEBON, p. 255.

[32] EUSTATHIUS, col. 932; *Patrol. orient.*, IV, 77; *Contra grammaticum*, LEBON, pp. 262, 263.

[33] *P. G.*, LXXXVI, 2, col. 1917 D; LEBON, p. 260.

natures," it is a misnomer, for two united natures are not two natures, but only one nature, a φύσις being one only if it is καθ' ἑαυτήν.[34]

After laying down these principles, Severus, like St. Cyril, starts from the Word in developing his Christological doctrine. It is the Word, who is, in Jesus Christ, the subject of the φύσις. The whole *economy* consists in the fact that the φύσις, which was ἄσαρκος, became σεσαρκωμένη. In that operation the Word is not modified or changed in any way; He becomes *otherwise,* but not *other* than He was; there is no new subject, but only a new state. Strictly speaking, Jesus Christ is the same person, the same individual as the Word: as such, He has not become as though He did not exist before, for He is eternal.[35]

We may now consider the humanity to which the Word unites Himself. That humanity did not exist before the Incarnation;[36] it did not come from heaven, it was taken from Mary; it is Mary who "through the ineffable and secret descent of the Holy Ghost gave from herself [to Christ] the humanity";[37] else she would not be His mother. Moreover, that humanity is complete. On this point, the Monophysites, and particularly Severus, cease to agree with Apollinaris, and are emphatic in asserting that the flesh of Jesus Christ was informed by a rational soul (ψυχὴ λογική).[38]

The union of the Word with humanity constitutes the ἕνωσις, the act of which Christ is the term. It is a ἕνωσις φυσική, κατὰ φύσιν, καθ' ὑπόστασιν, since its term is one nature, one only hypostasis, that of the Word incarnate.[39] But,

[34] Lebon, p. 273.

[35] Lebon, pp. 206, 209.

[36] Chabot, *Documenta,* p. 18; Lebon, p. 187.

[37] Mai, *Spicileg. rom.,* X, 212; *Classici auctores,* X, 411; Lebon, p. 185.

[38] Chabot, *Documenta,* p. 18; Mai, *Spicil. rom.,* X, 172; Lebon, p. 184.

[39] Severus dates the union from the moment of conception; he does

whilst rejecting both the merely moral union affirmed by the Nestorians, and the expression, *two natures,* used by the Chalcedonians, Severus also discards a union that would be a mixture and confusion of the human and the divine elements: *τὰ ἐξ ὧν εἷς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐν τῇ συνθέσει τελείως καὶ ἀμειώτως ὑφέστηκεν*:[40] and again: *τὰ ἐξ ὧν Ἐμμανουὴλ ὑφεστήκει καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν οὐ τέτραπται, ὑφέστηκε δὲ ἐν τῇ ἑνώσει.*[41] On this subject he had a protracted dispute with Sergius the Grammarian, who failed to understand how there could be, after the union, but one nature in Christ otherwise than through a confusion of the Word with the flesh. Severus vigorously denounces that "foolish attitude of the Synousiasts," to quote his own words.[42] He rejects the assertion that Emmanuel is only of one substance, quality and property, *μιᾶς οὐσίας τε καὶ ποιότητος καὶ ἑνὸς ἰδιώματος* and that the flesh informed by the rational soul has become with the Word *μίᾶς οὐσίας καὶ μιᾶς ποιότητος.*[43] He agrees with the Nestorians in acknowledging a difference between the flesh and the Word.[44] There is no confusion of substances, as is proved by the very comparison of the union between the body and the soul, so often given by Severus and borrowed from St. Cyril, for whilst that union terminates in one *φύσις* only, it excludes any mixture (*κρᾶσις*) of the elements thus united.[45]

However, although there is no mixture or fusion, there is a "synthesis," *σύνθεσις.* Synthesis or composition is that

not, however, admit that Jesus Christ was perfect, as man, at the first instant of His life: "It is a germ, then a man, and then a fruit," he said (Mai, *Class. auct.*, X, 412). This was also Philoxenus' view, who held that the animation of the body followed conception. Cf. Lebon, p. 192.

[40] *P. G.*, LXXXVI, 2, col. 1848 AB; Lebon, p. 215.

[41] *P. G., ib.*, col. 1845 D.

[42] Lebon, p. 216.

[43] *P. G.*, LXXXVI, 2, col. 1848; Lebon, pp. 215, 387.

[44] *P. G., ib.*, col. 1845 D.

[45] *Against Sergius,* Lebon, p. 230.

state in which the composing elements remain unchanged and are not combined, and yet have no separate existence, are not ἰδιοσυστάτοι;[46] it excludes both separation and mixture. Thus the φύσις of the Word, by becoming σεσαρκωμένη, becomes in consequence σύνθετος; it joins to itself a humanity which, whilst remaining a true humanity, does not subsist in itself, but in the Word.[47] Hence, that φύσις is neither διπλοῦς nor διττή; it merely comprises, in the order of existence, a new element which it did not comprise before: μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη.[48]

If humanity and divinity remain unchanged in the union, it follows that Christ is both consubstantial with the Father through His divinity and consubstantial with us through His humanity. Those Monophysites of whom we are now speaking, particularly Sergius, accept this conclusion unhesitatingly; Christ's twofold consubstantiality is for them a dogma; they condemn Eutyches for having denied it, and find it hard indeed to clear Dioscorus for having declared, in the *latrocinium* of Ephesus, that the old heresiarch was innocent. Dioscorus acted thus, they say, only because he was deceived regarding the faith of Eutyches.[49]

But if we distinguish in Christ a divine οὐσία and a human οὐσία, inconfused, how can we fail to proclaim two natures in Him? This is the objection urged against Severus by a somewhat undecided Chalcedonian, John the Grammarian,[50] and which forced him to adapt his terminology

[46] *P. G.*, LXXXVI, 2, col. 1848 A; LEBON, pp. 294, 295.

[47] *Doctrina*, DIEKAMP, p. 309 and foll. Cf. the correspondence with Sergius, LEBON, p. 321.

[48] LEBON, p. 319 and foll.

[49] LEBON, pp. 202, 204, 491 and foll.

[50] As Severus always objected that the formula δύο φύσεις implied the separation of natures, John adopted the formula ἐν δύο φύσεσιν ἀδιαιρέτοις μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν or ἐν δύο φύσεσιν ἀδιαιρέτοις ἐν ἑνὶ προσώπῳ. JOHN BAR APHT., *Vita Severi*, p. 248; *P. G.*, LXXXIX, col. 104 B; LEBON, p. 344.

to that of Chalcedon, although he does not surrender his system. Severus is willing to distinguish δύο φύσεις, but only τῇ θεωρίᾳ, τῇ φαντασίᾳ τοῦ νοῦ μόνον, τῷ νῷ, τῇ ἐπινοίᾳ, etc.[51] He cannot speak simply of δύο φύσεις after the union, since for him φύσις means a concrete individual, or person; but, like Cyril, he admits that, if we abstract momentarily from the union, Christ's elements appear to us as two natures, two hypostases and two persons.[52] But this is a mere figment of the brain, an exercise in logic. As soon as we again take up the union as it is in reality, we find but one person, one hypostasis and one nature.[53] Thus it is true that Christ is of two, ἐκ δύο, that He is ἐκ θεότητος καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος, ἐκ δύο φύσεων, ἐκ δύο πραγμάτων, ἐκ δύο ὑποστάσεων:[54] but it is also true that out of the two He is εἷς, μία φύσις, μία ὑπόστασις.

This answer of Severus does not solve the objection of John the Grammarian. Since Severus and his followers did not admit in Christ a confusion of the divine and human elements after the union, that distinction must appear in some way and be expressed by a formula that is not δύο φύσεις, but conveys a meaning equivalent to that of two natures. It is in connection with the subject of the properties of each element, and on the occasion of his controversy with Sergius, that Severus lays down that formula.

St. Leo had affirmed that, in the Incarnation, the property of each nature is safeguarded and that both natures retain their properties without loss.[55] Severus does not

[51] *P. G.*, LXXXVI, col. 908 A, 921 AB, 936 D; 2, col. 1841 C.

[52] *P. G.*, LXXXVI, 1, col. 908 A.

[53] *P. G.*, LXXXVI, 1, col. 908, 921 A, 924 B; 2, col. 1841 C; Lebon, pp. 346–352.

[54] *P. G.*, LXXXVI, 1, col. 920 D; Mai, *Spicil. rom.*, X, 215. Cf. Lebon, p. 376.

[55] "Salva igitur proprietate utriusque naturae et substantiae et in unam coeunte personam. . . . Tenet enim sine defectu proprietatem suam utraque natura, etc."

accept that way of speaking. If we understand by properties (ἰδιότης), he says, the attributes (ἰδιώματα) that befit either the humanity — such as visibility, intelligence, palpability,— or the divinity,— like eternity, immensity, invisibility,— it is true that these qualities or attributes continue to exist in the union; however, we must not regard them as belonging separately to two natures and as being so special to one of the two elements that, contrary to the *communicatio idiomatum,* they cannot be referred to the other, and especially to the Word, the only ultimate subject of all the various attributes.[56] But Severus knows of another kind of property, *viz.* that which he calls ἰδιότης ὡς ἐν ποιότητι φυσικῇ. We may recall what St. Cyril designated by ὁ τοῦ πῶς εἶναι λόγος, ποιότης φυσική, and which is the specific essence of a being, that which we call its nature; and of each one of Christ's elements, St. Cyril asserted that it retained its ποιότης φυσική in the union.[57] Severus makes this affirmation his own. True, we cannot divide attributes and qualities that are simple between two subjects; however, there is a quality so special to each one of the two elements that its communication to the other would imply a "mixture of essences"; it is its ποιότης φυσική, its specific essence. Since we cannot admit a confusion of humanity and divinity, we must admit that each possesses in itself, and does not share with the other, the property of being in itself what it is; there is, then, in Christ, a duality of property in natural quality, ἰδιότης ὡς ἐν ποιότητι φυσικῇ.[58]

Of Christ's action or ἐνέργεια Severus speaks almost just as he does of the properties of which ἐνέργεια is but a special form. His is a very simple theory. Borrowing from

[56] Lebon, p. 422 and foll., 428, 429.

[57] Ἐν ἰδιότητι τῇ κατὰ φύσιν ἑκατέρου μένοντός τε καὶ νοουμένου (*Epist.* XLVI, col. 241 B).

[58] Lebon, p. 433 and foll.

the Pseudo-Basil[59] the distinction between ἐνεργήσας, ἐνέργεια and ἐνεργηθέν, he teaches that the actions performed by Jesus Christ, the ἐνεργηθέντα, are evidently of two kinds: some are divine, others human; but, since the ἐνεργήσας in Jesus Christ is one, and since the ἐνέργεια is only the agent's operative motion, his κίνησις ἐνεργετική, it follows that, in the Savior, that ἐνέργεια is equally one with Himself: Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ εἷς ὁ ἐνεργῶν, μία αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐνέργεια καὶ ἡ κίνησις ἡ ἐνεργετική.[60] This ἐνέργεια is divine, since the φύσις of which it is the operative motion, is divine; but, as this φύσις is, through the Incarnation, σύνθετος, *i.e.*, united with the flesh, its action is similar and takes place in Jesus Christ in new conditions. It is a καινὴ θεανδρικὴ ἐνέργεια, as has been said by the Pseudo-Areopagite, with whose writings Severus is acquainted. The word καινή marks the novelty of the state which the Word has taken up, and the word θεανδρική is equivalent to σύνθετος, and shows that that state is the state of the φύσις σεσαρκωμένη of the Word.[61]

At the time of Severus, the question as to whether there are in Christ one or two wills, one or two operations, had not yet been raised. However, he himself records that John the Grammarian used to quote a passage from St. Athanasius which asserted the presence of two wills in Christ, one divine, the other human, and concluded that, since there were two wills in Christ, there

[59] In the *Advers. Eunomium*, IV. The reader may recall that the last two books of that work have not St. Basil for their author.

[60] Mansi, X, 1116, 1117, 1124; XI, 444; *P. G.*, LXXXVI, 1, col. 924 CD, 925 C; cf. 2, col. 1772 D, and the texts quoted by Lebon, p. 443 and foll. Severus reproves St. Leo's formula: "Agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione quod proprium est." To act implies subsistence, and to ascribe a proper action to the manhood, is to ascribe to it a proper and independent subsistence, in other words, to profess Nestorianism: Οὐ γὰρ ἐνεργεῖ ποτε φύσις οὐχ ὑφεστῶσα προσωπικῶς (*Doctrina*, Diekamp, p. 310).

[61] *Doctrina*, Diekamp, pp. 309, 310; Lebon, p. 451 and foll.

must also be two natures.[62] Severus claims that the subject must be looked at from another angle. We can and must admit in the Savior various acts of the will,—some in harmony with the weaknesses of humanity, others in conformity with the divine will, as we see in the agony in the garden; but these various acts must be referred to the same subject, *i.e.*, the Word Incarnate who produces them, and who wills ὡς ἄνθρωπος and ὡς θεός. The Patriarch of Antioch does not treat of the power of willing in particular; he is concerned rather with the acts, or, if he speaks of the will as the power of willing, he merely declares that in Christ it is one, since there is in Him only one subject that wills, as there is only one subject that acts: "The saintly and prudent Fathers," he says, "have taught that there existed [in Christ] but one activity and one divine will, both according to His divinity and His humanity."[63]

These are the main outlines of the Christological system of Severus of Antioch. As I have said, it was not exclusively *his* teaching; it was shared by a party which excelled all other Monophysite groups in number, talent, and influence.[64] But it is evident that, whilst restating with greater precision a few minor points of St. Cyril's doctrine, Severus and his school merely reproduce its substance. The words are taken in the same sense, the formulas are the

[62] Lebon, p. 461.

[63] Mansi, X, 1117; *Doctrina,* Diekamp, p. 310, and the texts quoted by Lebon, p. 461 and foll.

[64] This assertion could be easily proved by quotations from the Severian authors whom I have mentioned, particularly Timothy Ælurus and Philoxenus of Mabboug. Owing to the limits of this work, I cannot enter into a detailed exposition; but the reader will find in the work of M. Lebon, which I have already quoted so often, a cogent demonstration with texts in abundance. As regards Timothy, see the same author's article: *La christologie de Timothée Ælure d'après les sources syriaques inédites,* in the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique,* IX (1908), pp. 677–702.

same, the teaching is the same, *viz.*, a real Dyophysitism, which is afraid, as it were, to declare itself, together with an almost absolute Monophysitism as regards the wording.[65] However, between St. Cyril and Severus, or, if you prefer, between St. Cyril and Timothy, a great fact had happened, which Timothy, Severus, and their friends ignored. The Council of Chalcedon had authoritatively declared that Christ was in two natures and thus definitively settled both the dogma itself and the meaning of the words that express it. Hence, what was excusable in Cyril was no longer excusable in Timothy, Severus, etc. The Church had to regard these Monophysites as heretics and deal with them accordingly; and history, whilst admitting that in the main their notions were orthodox, cannot but regret their stubbornness and rebellion.

It is to Severian Monophysitism that the peculiar theory of the Agnoetæ owes its origin.[66] Liberatus relates[67] that, when the patriarch of Alexandria, Timothy II (520–536), had embraced the opinion of Severus of Antioch on the subject of Christ's "corruptibility," one of his deacons. The-

[65] This is the conclusion which Harnack has formulated (against Loofs) and which results also from M. Lebon's painstaking study: "The Monophysite doctrine of the Incarnation," he writes, "even and chiefly in Severus' scientific presentation, is nothing but the Cyrillian Christology. Severus arguing with the Grammarians forcibly reminds us of Cyril explaining his view and defending himself after the union of 433" (Introduct., p. xxi). Cf. also the article of F. Nau, *Dans quelle mesure les Jacobites sont-ils monophysites?* in the *Revue de l'Orient chrétien,* tom. X (1905), p. 113 and foll.

[66] Sources: The treatise *De sectis,* Act. V, 6; X, 3 (*P. G.,* LXXXVI, 1, col. 1232, 1261); Timothy, *De receptione haereticorum* (*P. G., ib.,* col. 41, 58); Eulogius of Alexandria, in Photius, *Bibliotheca,* cod. 230 (*P. G.,* CIII, 1, 80 sqq.); Liberatus, *Breviarium,* 19 (*P. L.,* LXVIII, 1034); St. Gregory the Great, *Epist.,* lib. X, *epist.* XXXV and XXXIX (*P. L.,* LXXVII). Cf. J. Lebreton, *Les origines du dogme de la Trinité,* Paris, 1910, p. 458 and foll.

[67] *Loc. cit.,* col. 1034.

mistius, concluded that, if Jesus experienced the needs and weaknesses of human nature, He must have been ignorant of a number of things. Timothy rejected that conclusion; Themistius seceded and founded — about the year 540, according to the author of the *De sectis* — the party of the Agnoetæ, ἀγνοηταί or ἀγνοῖται. Their doctrine was exceedingly simple: Jesus Christ, as man, shared in our ignorance. Ἀγνοεῖν τὸ ἀνθρώπινον τοῦ Χριστοῦ [68] — ἀγνοεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν οὐ καθὸ θεὸς ὑπῆρχεν ἀίδιος, ἀλλὰ καθὸ γέγονεν κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἄνθρωπος.[69] In support of this assertion they appealed to some texts of Scripture (*Marc.*, XIII, 32; *Ioan.*, XI, 34), and to the fact that Jesus, in His humanity, was consubstantial with us and like unto us in all things save sin.

Although this opinion, as is remarked by the author of the *De sectis,* had in its general tenor been held by several of the Fathers, it was considered erroneous at that particular time and condemned both by Monophysites and orthodox.[70] Theodosius II of Alexandria (532–538) wrote against it,[71] and Photius [72] has left the analysis of a work which Eulogius, an orthodox patriarch of Alexandria (580–607), composed against the Agnoetæ. Eulogius observes that the biblical texts alleged by them to prove the Savior's ignorance must be understood of an economical or anaphorical (κατὰ ἀναφοράν) ignorance, Jesus using those words, not in His own name, but as the representative of mankind, whose leader He is. Besides, he goes on to say, we may answer that ignorance befitted Christ, considered as a man, and inde-

[68] *De sectis,* X, 3, col. 1261.

[69] Sophronius of Jerusalem, *Epist. ad Sergium, P. G.,* LXXXVII, 3, col. 3192 D.

[70] As those who entertained that view were Monophysites, the orthodox concluded that they ascribed ignorance to the divine nature, the only one they acknowledged in Jesus Christ.

[71] *De sectis,* V, 6, col. 1232.

[72] *Biblioth.,* cod. 230, col. 1080 and foll.

pendently of the union, for one of the properties of human nature is not to know.[73] As to the Fathers who seem to admit some ignorance in Jesus Christ, they did not proclaim their view dogmatically, but merely suggested it as an argument in disputing against the Arians; unless they meant an anaphorical ignorance, which it is more pious to believe.

These are also the explanations given by Pope St. Gregory in two letters[74] which he sent in 600 to the same Eulogius of Alexandria. Gregory suggests the hypothesis either of an anaphorical or of an economical ignorance, as the case may demand; but he also suggests the hypothesis that the ignorance of Christ refers to His humanity, *nude sumpta*. The Savior knows the day and the hour of judgment "*in* natura humanitatis," not "*ex* natura humanitatis." "Incarnatus unigenitus . . . in natura quidem humanitatis novit diem et horam iudicii, sed tamen hunc non ex natura humanitatis novit. Quod ergo in ipsa novit non ex ipsa novit, quia Deus homo factus diem et horam iudicii per deitatis suae potentiam novit. . . . Diem ergo et horam iudicii scit Deus et homo; sed ideo quia Deus est homo."[75] The Pope concludes with these words, which definitively reprove the error of the Agnoetæ: "Res autem valde manifesta est quia quisquis nestorianus non est agnoita esse nullatenus potest."[76]

[73] Ἴδιον δὲ γνώρισμα ψιλῆς ἀνθρωπότητος ἡ ἄγνοια· κατὰ τοῦτο ῥηθείη ἂν ἐπὶ τῆς κατὰ Χριστὸν ἀνθρωπότητος, ὡς ἁπλῶς ἀνθρωπότητος, θεωρεῖσθαι τὴν ἄγνοιαν (col. 1084).

[74] Lib. X, *Epist.* XXXV and XXXIX.

[75] Col. 1097, 1098.

[76] Col. 1098.

CHAPTER V

EFFORTS MADE TO FUSE THE DECISIONS OF EPHESUS AND CHALCEDON

§ 1. The Case of the Scythian Monks.

THE peace agreement of the year 519 had sealed the official triumph of Chalcedonian orthodoxy in the East. But there still remained a problem both for theologians and statesmen: first, to explain how the decisions of the Council of 451, which had approved St. Cyril's teaching, could be harmonized with that teaching, and to make the agreement plain to the Severian Monophysites; second, to restore the religious unity that had been broken by the schism, and win over entire provinces that were seceding from the Emperor's rule. The period from 519 to 553 was devoted mainly to the accomplishment of this twofold task. It was marked by an effort on the part of theologians and statesmen to explain the doctrine of the two natures in a Cyrillian sense and thus to facilitate the reunion of the dissenters with the Church.

The effort for reunion began with what has been called the case of the Scythian monks. The legates of Hormisdas had no sooner landed at Constantinople than some monks connected with the household of the *magister militum,* Vitalian, asked that they approve the formula *Unus de Trinitate crucifixus est* or *passus est in carne,* εἷς τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος ἔπαθε σαρκί. This formula was a reassertion of St. Cyril's twelfth anathematism, which had been so severely

criticised by Theodoret and in which some had claimed to see a trace of Theopaschitism. Such a reassertion, the monks thought, was necessary to moderate the too great stress which the Chalcedonian formulas had put upon the distinction of the hypostases.[1]

Nothing could have been more inopportune than these fresh discussions at a time when peace was being restored between Rome and Constantinople. The legates, whose advice was sought soon after their arrival, referred the case to the Pope,[2] although they did not conceal their dislike for expressions that seemed to them a dangerous novelty, and for a step that appeared to involve a scheme directed against the Chalcedonian decisions. This was also the view taken by Justinian, who at that period already had a share in the government of the Empire. To his mind, these monks were busy-bodies, and their formulas empty words.[3] But the monks were tenacious. While four of them left for Rome to plead their cause before Hormisdas, the others worked on Justinian with so much skill that he became interested in their views and ultimately espoused them.[4]

[1] The allusion was, of course, to these well known passages of St. Leo's letter: "Salva igitur proprietate utriusque naturae et substantiae. . . . Tenet enim sine defectu proprietatem suam utraque natura. . . . Agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione quod proprium est." See an accurate exposition of the monks' plan in the beginning of the letter to St. Fulgentius, *P. L.*, LXV, col. 443.

[2] See the *Suggestiones* of Dioscorus and Bishops Germanus and John, in *P. L.*, LXIII, 471, 473.

[3] *Epist. Iustin. ad Hormisdam, P. L.*, LXIII, 475. Justinian was right; the anathematisms which the monks submitted to the Pope and into which they had condensed their doctrine, present a strange combination of Cyrillian and Chalcedonian terminology (*P. G.*, LXXXVI, 1, col. 87 and foll.). They may have been a clever piece of work, but could not serve as a clear expression of the Church's belief.

[4] Politics also had something to do with Justinian's change of attitude. For the churches of Antioch and Jerusalem had sent him an orthodox profession of faith that contained the Scythian formulas, and the Emperor thought that, if the Pope would approve those formulas, a

Justinian urged the Pope to make a decision. But Hormisdas temporized, attempted some sort of a refutation,[5] and finally left the matter in abeyance.[6]

The affair went no farther for the time being, but it came up again later on. The Scythian monks who were at Rome finally got tired of the Pope's dilatory policy and consulted with the group of African bishops who had been banished to Sardinia by Thrasamond.[7] St. Fulgentius, who was one of this group, sent a long letter in which he assured the monks that their doctrine was orthodox.[8] This was a victory. On the other hand, a group of Constantinopolitan monks, the Acœmetæ, well known for their fierce Dyophysitism, saw in the Pope's hesitation a condemnation of that doctrine, and therefore of the *communicatio idiomatum,* and came gradually to reject the θεοτόκος. Under these circumstances a decision became imperative. Justinian took the initiative. After a consultation with the Severians, in the year 531, he issued a decree anathematizing anyone who denied that "Jesus Christ, the Son of God, our incarnate God, who became man and was crucified, is one of the holy and consubstantial Trinity."[9] He asked the Pope — John II (532–535) — to approve this declaration.[10] The Pope seemed first to hesitate; but when he saw that the formula was deemed ortho-

reunion could be more easily effected (*P. L.,* LXIII, col. 501 and foll., 504).

[5] Cf. the letters to Justin, Justinian and Epiphanius, *P. L.,* LXIII, 509, 512, 513.

[6] However, he complained bitterly to Bishop Possessor, exiled at Constantinople, of the indiscretion of the monks who had come to Rome (*Epist.* LXX, *P. L.,* LXIII, 490); this complaint drew upon him the violent and, on the whole, unjust answer of the monk Maxentius (*P. G.,* LXXXVI, 1, col. 93 and foll.).

[7] *P. L.,* LXV, 442 and foll.

[8] *Epist.* XVII, *P. L.,* LXV, 451 and foll.

[9] Lex Iustin. Cod. I, 1, 6.

[10] *P. L.,* LXVI, 14 and foll.

dox by Occidental theologians,[11] he granted the approval, and wrote to Justinian and to the senate [12] "quod quia apostolicae doctrinae convenit, nostra auctoritate confirmamus." The Acœmetæ were condemned in the same letters. This made it plain that the decisions of Chalcedon must not be identified with Nestorianism, and that their supporters accepted unhesitatingly the doctrine of the one personality of the Word in Christ and of the *communicatio idiomatum*. Nevertheless, the Pontiff's approval meant a real victory for St. Cyril's Christological teaching, and Justinian strove to profit by it, demanding of all the bishops — with the purpose of bringing about an agreement among them — that they subscribe to the formulas that had been approved.[13] The Monophysites gave their signatures; but this does not mean that they submitted to the Council of 451.

§ 2. From the Dispute of the Three Chapters to the Fifth General Council.[14]

Meanwhile Justinian, who had become sole emperor in the year 529, anxious to restore religious unity, made many advances to the dissenters. In the year 531,[15] conferences

[11] The Roman deacon Anatolius consulted the deacon Ferrandus of Carthage, who replied that he saw no objection against the decree (*P. L.*, LXVII, 889 and foll.).

[12] *P. L.*, LXVI, 17 and foll., 20 and foll. The letters are dated March 24, 534.

[13] Harnack (*Lehrb. der DG.*, II, p. 416; English transl., vol. IV, pp. 242, 243), calls these formulas a new *henoticon*. This is, I believe, an exaggeration. The fact that they were accepted both by the Occidentals and the Africans, proves conclusively that they trenched in no way upon the authority of the Council of Chalcedon.

[14] On the dispute of the Three Chapters, in general, cf. L. Duchesne, *Vigile et Pélage*, in the *Revue des questions historiques*, vol. XXXVI (1884). A. Knecht, *Die Religionspolitik Kaiser Justinians I.* Würzburg, 1896. A. de Meissas, *Nouvelles études sur l'histoire des Trois Chapitres*, in the *Annales de Phil. chrétienne*, 1904. G. Glaizolle, *Justinien, son rôle dans les controverses*, Lyons, 1905.

[15] Or 533, according to others. As these conferences seem to have

went on regularly at his request between a group of orthodox bishops and a group of Monophysite bishops at Constantinople, with a view to effect an agreement.[16] These conferences have become famous in history, because at them the writings of Dionysius the Areopagite were mentioned for the first time — invoked by the Severians. In the name of Catholic orthodoxy Hypatius of Ephesus immediately questioned the authenticity of those writings. If they are authentic, he said, why were they never quoted by the ancient Fathers, particularly by St. Cyril? [17]

These conferences led to no agreement.[18] But Justinian did not become discouraged. His wife Theodora, a stanch Monophysite, induced him to summon Severus (534–535) to Constantinople. This was an unwise step, as the event showed: for the new patriarch of Constantinople, Anthimus, who had been chosen at Theodora's instigation to succeed Epiphanius, in 535, went over to Mo-

lasted for quite a while, a year or more, the two dates can be easily reconciled.

[16] See a brief account of these conferences in MANSI, VIII, 817 and foll.

[17] Col. 821. The author of these writings, who as yet has not been identified with certainty, probably wrote about the end of the 5th century. He apparently belonged to the Severian party, though he does not seem to take much interest in the Christological controversies that were then going on. Neither the formula *μία φύσις*, nor *δύο φύσεις*, is found in his works. The Word, or rather Jesus, has been joined (*συνετέθη*) without change and confusion (*ἀναλλαιωτῶς καὶ ἀσυγχυτῶς*) to a complete humanity. He was truly and fully man (*κατ' οὐσίαν ὅλην ἀληθῶς ἄνθρωπος ὤν*); and yet, though He was man, He was above man. "It was not as became a God that He performed things divine, nor as became a man that He performed things human, but He placed before us a new theandric operation, *viz.*, that of a God who had become man" (*ἀνδρωθέντος θεοῦ καινήν τινα τὴν θεανδρικὴν ἐνέργειαν ἡμῖν πεπολιτευμένος*). Later on, these last words gave rise to many a commentary (cf. *De divin. nominibus*, I, § 4; II, 10; *Epist.* IV ad Caium, *P. G.*, III, 592 A, 648, 649, 1072).

[18] Only one Monophysite bishop, Philoxenus of Doliche, was won over.

nophysitism and entered into communion with Theodosius of Alexandria. Had it not been for the energy of Pope Agapitus, another schism would have arisen. Warned by Ephrem, patriarch of Antioch, and forced to leave Rome for Constantinople, on the occasion of the invasion of Italy by the Goths (535), Agapitus compelled Anthimus to resign and replaced him by Mennas (535–552). The Pope died shortly after; but the Chalcedonian reaction continued for some time, and it seemed for a while as though the danger of a revival of Monophysitism was over. Yet, that danger lasted as long as Theodora lived and as long as Justinian kept his fondness for dogmatizing.

This fondness found something to feed upon through a revival of Origenist doctrines in certain convents of Palestine. The movement assumed some importance, and when, about the year 537, two Origenists of note, Domitian and Theodore Askidas, were appointed to the sees of Ancyra and Cæsarea in Cappadocia, Peter, patriarch of Jerusalem, thought the moment for acting had come, and requested the Emperor to condemn Origen and the errors that had found a shelter under his name. His request was supported by the apocrisiary Pelagius, who afterwards became Pope, but was then at Constantinople. Such an appeal could not but please Justinian. In 543 he published a long memorandum, comprising a letter against Origen, followed by twenty-four extracts from the *Periarchon,* and ten anathematisms against the great Alexandrian doctor and his erroneous views.[19] That Origen had actually upheld all the errors as-

[19] Mansi, IX, 488–533; *P. G.*, LXXXVI, 1, col. 945–989. I shall not dwell at length upon this Origenist controversy, which is, after all, of secondary importance for the history of dogmas. Cf. on the whole subject F. Diekamp, *Die origenistischen Streitigkeiten im sechsten Jahrhundert,* Münster, 1899; Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des conc.,* II, 2, p. 1182 and foll. (English transl., vol. IV, p. 217 and foll.), and the brief exposition of F. Prat, *Origène,* Paris, 1907, Introduction. In the

cribed to him by the Emperor, was far from certain; but that did not matter. A synod ἐνδημοῦσα gave prompt adhesion to the condemnation pronounced against him, and the two Origenist bishops, Domitian and Theodore, whom their opponents had aimed to put in a quandary, did likewise; but to turn Justinian's attention away from Origenism, they suggested to him, as Liberatus relates,[20] to condemn Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, and Ibas, who were suspected of Nestorianism and particularly hated by the Monophysites. Such a condemnation, they urged, would make a good impression on the dissenters, and leave them no pretext to refuse communion with the orthodox, especially since they had accepted the Scythian formulas, and thus religious reunion would be restored at last.

This reasoning was somewhat specious, and it was quite true that, by renouncing Theodoret and Ibas, the orthodox would make the obstinacy of the heretics still more inexcusable. Justinian fell into the snare that was laid for him. In 544, he published an edict, of which some sentences only are extant.[21] It comprised two parts: a letter to the bishops, which contained a profession of faith; and a condemnation of Theodore (of Mopsuestia), of the writings of Theodoret and Ibas' letter to Maris.[22] The Emperor expressly as-

year 552. Theodore of Scythopolis had to accept, besides the ten anathematisms, three others that condemned a mixture of Origenist ideas with the pantheism of Bar Sudaili, known as *Isochristism* (*Libellus de error. Origenis, P. G.*, LXXXVI, 1, col. 232–236). Later on, perhaps at the 5th General Council of the year 553, the bishops, at Justinian's request, condemned fifteen similar propositions (see their text in Mansi, IX, 395; Hefele, *loc. cit.*, p. 1191 — English transl., p. 225; Hahn, § 175); without, however, attributing them to Origen.

[20] *Breviar.*, 24, col. 1049.

[21] In Facundus, *Pro defensione trium capitulorum*, II, 3 (*P. L.*, LXVII, 566, 567) and IV, 4 (col. 628). We learn the contents of that document from the letter of Pontianus to Justinian (*ibid.*, col. 995).

[22] These were the *Three Chapters* (τρία κεφάλαια), as they were called later, *viz.*, (1) the person and works of Theodore of Mopsuestia;

serted the authority of the Council of Chalcedon, which had proclaimed the orthodoxy of Theodoret and Ibas: *"Si quis dixerit haec nos ad abolendos aut excludendos sanctos Patres qui in Chalcedonensi fuerunt concilio dixisse, anathema sit."*

This, then, was the edict to which all the bishops had to subscribe. The four patriarchs of the East yielded, though reluctantly, and most of the bishops followed in their footsteps.[23] The Pope's assent was more difficult to obtain.

The then Pope, Vigilius (538–555), had ascended the papal chair (we learn from Liberatus) through Theodora's protection, given in return for a promise that he would favor her religious policy and uphold Anthimus, Theodosius of Alexandria, and Severus.[24] These were rather inauspicious beginnings. Once he was installed, Vigilius endeavored to make people forget these beginnings and did his best to forget his own promise, by addressing to Justinian and the patriarch Mennas some highly orthodox letters.[25] The edict against the Three Chapters did not impose Monophysitism, yet, in spite of its author's protestations, it seemed to run counter to several decisions of the Council of Chalcedon. Vigilius realized this and knew that most of the Occidental bishops, particularly those of North Africa, Dalmatia, and Illyricum, regarded the Emperor's interference with displeasure. Ferrandus, a deacon of Carthage, who was one of the

(*2*) the writings of Theodore in behalf of Nestorius and against St. Cyril and the Council of Ephesus; (3) the letter of Ibas to Maris.

[23] Facundus, *Pro defens.*, IV, 4; *Liber contra Mocianum* (*P. L.*, LXVII, col. 625, 626, 861); Liberatus, *Brev.*, 24, col. 1049.

[24] Liberatus, *Breviar.*, 22, col. 1039. The reader will do well to remember that Liberatus was one of Vigilius' enemies.

[25] *P. L.*, LXIX, 21, 25. These letters are dated September 17, 540. The letter to Anthimus, Theodosius and Severus, in which Vigilius professes the same faith as they do (see the text in Liberatus, *Breviar.*, 22, and Victor of Tunnunum, *Chronicle*, *P. L.*, LXVIII, 957), is very probably apocryphal, invented by the Pope's adversaries (Duchesne, *Le lib. pontific.*, I, 300).

intellectual leaders of the Church of Africa, had expressly declared himself against the edict.[26] To his mind, the dead had better be left alone, and besides, it was a dangerous policy to reconsider what had already been decided by a council. Vigilius realized that he had strong support and refused to approve the condemnation pronounced by Justinian. Had the Pope been independent, all would have turned out well; but Justinian was master at Rome. He commanded Vigilius to come to Constantinople, and the latter obeyed, probably under compulsion.

He arrived at Constantinople, January 25, 547, and first showed great firmness. But this firmness gradually relaxed, and conferences began for the purpose of examining the question of the Three Chapters. The bishop of Hermiana, Facundus, who took part in those conferences, has left us some account of them. Facundus willingly gave up Theodore of Mopsuestia, with whom the Council of 451 had not concerned itself; but he thought that, through Theodoret and Ibas, a blow was aimed at the decisions of Chalcedon, and therefore defended these with all his might.[27] However, seventy bishops declared themselves against the Three Chapters, and on April 11, 548, Vigilius gave his *Iudicatum*.

Only a few fragments remain of that document, which was addressed to Menas.[28] It condemns (1) the person and all the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia; (2) the letter of Ibas to Maris, as contrary to the true faith, and all those who approved that letter; (3) the writings of Theodoret, directed against the true faith and St. Cyril's anathematisms. The authority of the Council of Chalcedon is put above discussion, and Vigilius certainly did not mean

[26] *Epist.* VI, *P. L.*, LXVII, 921 and foll.

[27] Facundus, *Liber contra Mocianum*, col. 850, 860.

[28] Quoted by Justinian and Vigilius himself, Mansi, IX, 181 and foll., 104 and foll.; *P. L.*, LXIX, 111.

to derogate from its authority. In fact, every statement of the *Iudicatum* had been drawn up with that object in view, and the Pope had taken pains to distinguish carefully between the case of Theodore and that of Theodoret and Ibas, condemning only a few writings of these last two authors. Nevertheless the papal document had a very bad effect. Whilst at Constantinople Vigilius beheld himself given up by Facundus and by Dacius, bishop of Milan, by his deacons and his own nephew, he received the news that the bishops of Dalmatia and Illyricum refused to accept his decisions, and that those of North Africa had excommunicated him till he would do penance.[29] On seeing the rising storm, Vigilius withdrew the *Iudicatum* and decided, in concert with the Emperor, that nothing be done either for or against the Three Chapters, until the meeting of a general council, which was planned.[30] Perplexed as he was, the Pope strove at least to gain time.

The Emperor hastened to make the necessary preparations for the projected council. But it soon became plain that the duty of silence on the subject of the Three Chapters was too much of a burden for him. At the suggestion of Theodore Askidas, he published a new edict against them in 551, the *Ὁμολογία πίστεως Ἰουστινιανοῦ αὐτοκράτορος κατὰ τῶν τριῶν κεφαλαίων*.[31]

This lengthy document, which betrays a close doctrinal

[29] *Epist. Vigilii ad Rusticum et Sebastianum* (*P. L.*, LXIX, 43); *Epist. clericorum Italiae* (*ibid.*, 113, 115); Victor of Tunnunum, *Chronicle*, *P. L.*, LXVIII, 958.

[30] Mansi, IX, 59. The only thing Justinian required and obtained from Vigilius was a written oath — destined to remain secret — by which the Pope pledged himself to bring about, if possible, the condemnation of the Three Chapters (Mansi, IX, 363). This pledge, dated August 15, 550, was made public by the Emperor in the seventh session of the Council of 553. Its authenticity has been questioned, though, I think, on insufficient grounds.

[31] Mansi, IX, 537–581; *P. G.*, LXXXVI, 1, col. 993–1035.

relationship with the theology of Leontius of Byzantium, is made up of three parts: an exposition of faith, a series of thirteen anathematisms, and a refutation of objections. I shall dwell only on a few details of special interest.

The exposition of faith combined the decisions of Ephesus with those of Chalcedon. Christ is *εἷς, σύνθετος ἐκ θεότητος καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος* (col. 541).[32] Although Justinian asserted the duality of natures, he accepted the Cyrillian formula *μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη*, because in that formula, he said, Cyril employed the word *φύσις* in the sense of *ὑπόστασις*. The comparison of the body and soul, which is misused by the Monophysites, he went on to say, is no proof in favor of one nature in Jesus Christ; for, in man, body and soul make up a nature that may be common to several individuals, whereas out of the union of the Word with humanity there does not result a *χριστότης* in which several persons could participate (col. 548, 549). To count the natures in Jesus Christ is not the same as to separate them, for that counting takes place *μόνῳ λόγῳ καὶ θεωρίᾳ* (col. 549). There follow certain notions of nature and person which we shall meet again later. The conclusion was to the effect that Christ's human nature never had an hypostasis and personality of its own, but existed from the beginning in the hypostasis of the Logos,— *ἐν τῇ ὑποστάσει τοῦ Λόγου τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑπάρξεως ἔλαβεν* (col. 556).

The thirteen anathematisms which follow the doctrinal exposition, were reproduced substantially by the 5th General Council, and we shall speak of them later. The 11th, 12th and 13th formally condemn the Three Chapters. As to the third part of the edict, it answered the difficulties drawn from the approval of the letter of Ibas by the Council of Chalcedon, and especially the objection that personally Theodore could not be condemned, since he had died in

[32] The columns referred to are those of Mansi's work.

communion with the Church. The whole document ended with a brief conclusion.

The publication of the Ὁμολογία was, of course, extremely offensive to the Pope. First he advised the bishops not to accept it;[33] then, realizing he was in danger, he took refuge, in August 551, in the basilica of Hormisdas, and, no sooner had he come back to his palace, at the Emperor's request, than he fled again, as far as Chalcedon, into the church of St. Euphemia. It was there that, in January 552, he published a sentence of deposition against Theodore Askidas, and of excommunication against Mennas.[34] An *epistula encyclica,* in which he justified his conduct, appeared a few days later (February 5, 552).[35]

This energetic action of the Pope set the Emperor to thinking. At his suggestion, Mennas, Theodore, and a few other bishops submitted to Vigilius a profession of faith which he deemed satisfactory.[36] The Pontiff consented to return to Constantinople, and there received, on January 6, 553, the profession of faith of Eutychius,[37] who after the demise of Mennas (August 552) had become patriarch. Eutychius solemnly accepted the first four general councils, the letters of the Popes, particularly of St. Leo, and declared his willingness to submit the matter of the Three Chapters to the decision of the future council. Thus things had come back to where they were before Justinian's interference.

§ 3. The Fifth General Council.

Meanwhile, the council that had been talked of for so many years, had been convoked. The Pope's intention was

[33] *Epist. encycl.; Fragm. damnat. Theodori* (Mansi, IX, 50, 59).
[34] Mansi, IX, 58 and foll.; *P. L.,* LXIX, 59 and foll.
[35] Mansi, IX, 50; *P. L.,* LXIX, 53.
[36] It is inserted in Vigilius' first *Constitutum,* Mansi, IX, 62, 63; *P. L.,* LXIX, 67 and foll.
[37] Mansi, IX, 63; Greek, 185, 188; *P. L.,* LXIX, 69, 70.

that it be held in Italy or Sicily.[38] On the Emperor's refusal, Vigilius, in turn, refused to take any part whatever in a council consisting exclusively of Greek bishops. Then, Justinian proposed to give the same number of representatives to each party, *i.e.*, each patriarchate. The Pope persisted in his refusal; but the Emperor went ahead, and on May 5, 553, the Fifth General Council opened at Constantinople.[39]

It was presided over by Eutychius and counted first a hundred and fifty-one, and towards the end, a hundred and sixty-four bishops. Six African bishops attended the first session, and eight, the last. The first three sessions present nothing worthy of remark. When he was invited to attend, Vigilius, on May 6, demanded a delay and promised to express his sentiments within twenty days. In the 4th session, on May 12 or 13, the bishops began to examine the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia; seventy-one extracts and his profession of faith were read. On May 17, the day of the fifth session, the question came up as to whether or not Theodore should be condemned, even though he had died in communion with the Church. During the rest of the session, extracts from Theodoret's works, that seemed contrary to the faith and injurious to St. Cyril, were read. The sixth session (May 19) was devoted to Ibas. First his letter to Maris was read, and most of the bishops thought it ought to be condemned. Then Theodore Askidas and three other bishops began a more thorough study of the subject. It was objected that Ibas' letter had been approved by several members of the Council of Chalcedon. This was certainly the case; and it was precisely that approbation which the four bishops just mentioned endeavored to explain. But,

[38] Mansi, IX, 64; *P. L.*, LXIX, 70.

[39] Cf. the acts in Mansi, IX; cf. Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des conciles*, III, 1 (English transl., vol. IV, p. 289 and foll.).

instead of taking up the far more important votes of Leo's legates and Maximus of Antioch, they explained only that of Eunomius. Finally the bishops present exclaimed that the letter was heretical and blasphemous; and with this, the sixth session came to an end.

It was at this particular juncture that Vigilius re-appeared on the stage. On May 14, 553, he placed in Justinian's hands a memoir containing his judgment on the subject of the Three Chapters. This is the *Constitutum Vigilii papae de tribus capitulis,*[40] one of the best literary compositions that has come down to us from the 6th century. It is addressed to the Emperor and can be divided into three parts.

The first reproduces the two professions of faith presented by Theodore Askidas and Mennas, and later by Eutychius, and sums up the events till the opening of the Council.

The second consists in an examination of the Three Chapters. As to Theodore, the Pope did not hesitate to admit his heterodoxy. Taking the seventy-one extracts, of which the Emperor had sent him the text, he retained fifty-nine — to which he added another, the 13th — and accompanied these sixty extracts with an anathema. On the other hand, however, Theodore had been condemned neither at Ephesus nor at Chalcedon, and the Church is not wont to condemn the dead. Consequently, Vigilius refrained from condemning Theodore's person and would not allow others to do so, although the dogmatic fragments quoted remained, of course, absolutely proscribed in their obvious meaning (*secundum subiectos intellegentiae sensus*).[41]

Then, coming to Theodoret, the Pope refused to condemn him. Theodoret had been received by the Council of Chalcedon; he had anathematized Nestorius. As to the insults

[40] Mansi, IX, 61–106; *P. L.*, LXIX, 67–114.
[41] Mansi, *loc. cit.*, 96; *P. L., loc. cit.*, 102.

aimed at St. Cyril, the Bishop of Cyrus had denied their authorship, and Cyril himself had been unwilling to have them recalled. Why be more exacting than St. Cyril and the Council? Hence Vigilius forbade to condemn any writing under the name or with the name of Theodoret (*sub taxatione nominis eius*); however, he condemned any proposition contrary to the faith — whether it came from Theodoret or from anyone else — and, to make good his assertion, subjoined five anathematisms directed against Nestorian propositions.[42]

Lastly, passing on to Ibas, the *Constitutum* points out that at the Council of Chalcedon the legates Paschasinus and Lucentius declared that "after hearing the letter of Ibas read (before them), they had acknowledged its orthodoxy"; that Anatolius of Constantinople asserted that, from the reading of the preceding documents (among them, the letter to Maris), it was evident that Ibas was innocent; and that Maximus of Antioch affirmed that that letter proved that the faith, the *dictatio* (ἡ ὑπαγορία) of the Bishop of Edessa, was orthodox. These declarations, Vigilius went on to say, far from being challenged, were confirmed by the other members of the Council. This does not mean, of course, that the Council approved the insults uttered by Ibas against Cyril; yet Ibas had sufficiently retracted those insults by accepting the communion of the Patriarch of Alexandria. Then, after dwelling on the dangerous consequences that would follow from reversing the judgment of the Council of Chalcedon, the Pope concluded that the judgment which declared Ibas orthodox and was based, at least partly, on

[42] The reader will notice that the fourth anathematism seems to condemn the Agnoetæ, though not absolutely: "Si quis unum Iesum Christum verum Dei et eumdem ipsum verum hominis filium futurorum ignorantiam aut diei ultimi iudicii habuisse dicit, et tanta scire potuisse quanta ei deitas quasi alteri cuidam inhabitans revelabat, anathema sit" (Mansi, *loc. cit.*, 98; *P. L., loc. cit.*, 104. Cf. Hahn, § 228).

an accurate understanding of the letter of Ibas to Maris (*ex verbis epistulae viri venerabilis Ibae rectissimo ac piissimo intellectu perspectis*), ought to remain entire and unchanged in so far as it concerned the aforesaid letters.[43]

In consequence, and as a general conclusion, Vigilius forbade all clerics to attempt to change in any way, by addition or subtraction, the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon, and cautioned all those in sacred orders and all ecclesiastical dignitaries against writing, uttering, composing or teaching any doctrine contrary to the present *Constitutum,* or to renew the controversy concerning the Three Chapters.[44]

These are the main outlines of that lengthy document which was signed by Vigilius, sixteen bishops and six clerics.[45] This energetic act could not but displease the Emperor, who gave vent to his feelings at the seventh session, May 26, 553, when the Imperial Quæstor read several documents destined to confound the Pope's boldness [46] and communicated a letter of Justinian, commanding that the name of Vigilius be deleted from the diptychs, because, by upholding the Three Chapters, he had shared in the wickedness of Nestorius and excluded himself from the Church. The letter added, however, that it was the Emperor's intention to remain in communion with the Apostolic See, for the perversity of Vigilius, and indeed of anyone else, could in no way affect the peace of the Church. The Council ac-

[43] Mansi, IX, 101, 102; *P. L., loc. cit.,* 108.

[44] Mansi, IX, 105; *P. L., loc. cit.,* 112.

[45] Among others, by the deacon Pelagius, who became Vigilius' successor in the papal chair.

[46] One of the documents is the formula of the oath taken by Vigilius in 550, of which we have already spoken. Besides, two supposed letters of Vigilius, one to Justinian, the other to Theodora, condemning the Three Chapters and admitting in Jesus Christ *unam subsistentiam et unam personam et unam operationem.* On the legates' protest, these two letters were declared false and apocryphal by the 6th General Council (Mansi, XI, 588, 589, 592).

cepted the imperial command and also declared its intention to remain united with the See of Rome: "Servemus itaque unitatem ad apostolicam sacrosanctae ecclesiae sedem antiquioris Romae."[47] Thus a distinction was made between the *sedes* and the *sedens;* but the Council which, till then, had met in spite of the Pope, now met against him, and thus became schismatic.

In order to complete their work, the bishops had but one thing to do, *viz.,* to condemn the Three Chapters and indirectly the Pope who had upheld them. This they did on June 2, in the eighth session, which was also the last. They approved a long document that comprised two parts: first, an exposition of what had taken place in the Council, followed by an anathema against the Three Chapters and all those who had upheld them or would uphold them in the future;[48] then, fourteen anathematisms, which were substantially the same as those of Justinian in his Ὁμολογία πίστεως. Their subject matter was as follows:[49]

The first defines the doctrine of the Trinity.

The second declares that two births, eternal and temporal, must be attributed to the Word.

The third asserts the identity of the Word with Jesus Christ, the same person, both God and man, working miracles and suffering.

The fourth condemns the σχετική union of Nestorius, and the various ways in which he expressed it; and also the union κατὰ σύγχυσιν of Apollinaris and Eutyches. It accepts the union καθ' ὑπόστασιν or κατὰ σύνθεσιν, which, whilst excluding the separation of the two natures, maintains their distinction.

The fifth is directed against those who saw in the unity

[47] Mansi, IX, 367.
[48] Mansi, IX, 376.
[49] Mansi, IX, 376 and foll.; Hahn, *Biblioth.,* § 148.

of hypostasis or person in Jesus Christ the mere moral unity of two persons or hypostases, and ascribed this teaching to the Council of Chalcedon. Another person or hypostasis has been no more added to the Trinity, than to the Word, who is one of the Trinity.

The sixth anathematism defines that Mary is truly θεοτόκος, not figuratively only, and that the Council of Chalcedon thus understood that expression. The appellations ἀνθρωποτόκος and χριστοτόκος are forbidden.

The seventh condemns those who, in distinguishing and counting two natures in Jesus Christ, do not make that distinction θεωρίᾳ μόνῃ, but ascribe to each nature a distinct subsistence of its own.

The eighth explains that the formulas ἐκ δύο φύσεων and μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη must not be understood of an identity of the φύσις or οὐσία of the divinity and humanity, resulting from confusion of the two, but of a personal unity. The two natures retain their specific being in the union: the Church condemns both those who separate the natures and those who confound them.

The ninth proscribes both the twofold adoration of Christ in the Nestorian sense, and the unique adoration of Him in the Eutychian sense, since the latter implies that the divinity is but one φύσις or οὐσία with the body. The Word united to the body must be adored in one adoration.

The tenth anathematism defines that Jesus Christ, crucified in His body, is God and one of the Trinity.

The eleventh pronounces anathema against anyone who does not condemn Arius, Eunomius, Apollinaris, Macedonius, Nestorius, Eutyches, Origen and their writings, and generally all the heretics condemned by the Church and the first four councils, and all those who share their views.

The twelfth is directed against Theodore of Mopsuestia, and all those who profess or defend his teaching and works.

The thirteenth is aimed at Theodoret. It condemns all those who defend or refuse to condemn the ungodly statements he wrote against the true faith and the first Council of Ephesus, against St. Cyril and his twelve anathematisms, and generally in behalf of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Nestorius, and those who shared their views.

The fourteenth is concerned with Ibas. It anathematizes all those who uphold or refuse to condemn his wicked letter to Maris,[50] and all those who had written or would write in its defence, invoking for that purpose the authority of the Council of Chalcedon.

The document concluded with a sentence of deposition against those bishops and clerics, and a sentence of anathema against those monks and laymen, who would dare to spread, teach or write anything contrary to its contents. A hundred and sixty-four bishops, including Eutychius, subscribed to it. This was the last act of the Council.

The Emperor lost no time in having the sentence signed and ratified by the bishops who had attended the assembly. In the East, he met with little resistance; but he was anxious to obtain the assent also of the Occidentals, and especially of the Pope, whom the Council had directly antagonized. This was a much more difficult task. The Latins were anything but prompt in giving their signatures, and all the means of violence, threats, and exile were used against them, though without success.[51] The supposition that Vigilius himself was exiled cannot be proved.[52] It is a fact, however, that the Pope yielded at last and accepted the decisions of the Council. This fact rests, not merely on the independent testimony of historians, but also on two documents.

[50] The reader will notice that, as before, the Council does not affirm that the letter is certainly the work of Ibas: Τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τῆς λεγομένης παρὰ Ἴβα γεγράφθαι. Ibas' followers denied its authenticity.

[51] Victor of Tunnunum, *Chronicle*, col. 960.

[52] *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, I, 299; cf. 301, note 28.

The first is the letter of Vigilius to Eutychius "pro confirmatione quintae synodi oecumenicae," [53] dated December 8, 553. After ascribing his former resistance to Satan's cunning, the Pope condemns the Three Chapters in the sense of the Council, and annuls whatever he and others had done to uphold them.

The second document is another *Constitutum,*[54] dated February 23, 554. It was perhaps addressed to the Latin bishops, and the lengthy discussions into which it enters are evidently designed to answer the objections of those who upheld the Three Chapters.[55] Its conclusion is the same as that of the letter to Eutychius.

Thus, the 5th General Council had condemned the Three Chapters, and the Pope definitively accepted that condemnation. It was a triumph for the imperial policy, all the more complete as Vigilius' successor, Pelagius (556–561), who had at first also opposed that policy, finally accepted it. However, the West refused for many years to follow suit, and many a local schism arose as a protest against the decisions of the Council and the Pope. In Dalmatia, North Africa, Northern Italy, Venetia, Istria, Liguria, Illyricum, and Tuscany, many dissenting bishops rejected communion with Pelagius.[56] His successors, particularly St. Gregory the Great,[57] succeeded in gradually bringing back to the

[53] Mansi, IX, 414–419; *P. L.,* LXIX, 122–128.

[54] *Vigilii papae constitutum pro damnatione trium capitulorum,* Mansi, IX, 457–488; *P. L.,* LXIX, 143–178.

[55] It is mainly the letter of Ibas that Vigilius has in view. The Pope endeavors to show (1) that said letter is not really the work of Ibas; (2) that it was not considered orthodox by any of the bishops at Chalcedon. This second assertion is confirmed by an anathema against all who maintain the contrary.

[56] Cf. the letters of Pelagius, III, IV, V, IX (*P. L.,* LXIX).

[57] Cf. *Epist.,* lib. III, *epist.* XXIX, XXX; lib. IV, *epist.* II, III, IV, XXXVIII, XXXIX; lib. V, *epist.* LI; lib. XII, *epist.* XXXIII; lib. XIII, *epist.* XXXIII.

Roman Church the dioceses that had seceded from it; however the last traces of the schism did not disappear till the time of Sergius I (687–701),[58] a hundred and fifty years later. In France and Spain, whilst there was hostility, no formal rupture took place. As to the Monophysites, for whose benefit Justinian had made all those advances and occasioned all those disturbances, their return to the Church was by no means hastened.

On the whole, the controversy about the Three Chapters was a very unfortunate affair, which impaired to some extent the credit of all those who took part in it: — the Emperor, the Council, and the Pope.[59] This does not mean that, in themselves, the decisions that were finally taken were not correct and tenable. Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, and Ibas could rightly be condemned in the way it was actually done; the writings even of the last two contained statements deserving of censure, especially if we bear in mind the terminology of the 5th century. But, whilst that condemnation had the advantage of putting an end to the recriminations of the Monophysites, it had the disadvantage of reawakening quarrels that were nearly extinct, and of weakening the authority of the Council of Chalcedon. In the peculiar fusion which was attempted between the Cyrillian theology, that had triumphed at Ephesus, and the Antiochian theology, which had been received at Chalcedon, the latter paid all the costs.[60]

[58] *Liber pontificalis,* I, 376, XV; cf. 381, note 45.

[59] From a theological viewpoint, two questions may be raised in connection with this controversy. (1) Did not the 5th General Council contradict the Council of Chalcedon, especially in what refers to Ibas and his letter? (2) How are we to reconcile the dogma of papal infallibility with Vigilius' contradictory statements in the *Constitutum* and the *Iudicatum?* We have not to answer these questions here. They can be easily solved, if one accurately applies the theological principles involved.

[60] Cf., *v. g.,* the explanation given of the formulas ἐκ δύο φύσεων and

§ 4. The Christology of Leontius of Byzantium.

Simultaneously with the politicians, the theologians were also striving to show the agreement of the two theologies that were facing each other, and whilst their efforts were not always successful in converting the dissenters, they at least threw some new light on the subtle questions involved. Among those who applied themselves to that work with distinction, we must name Ephrem, patriarch of Antioch (527–544), of whom only a few fragmentary writings are still extant,[61] and the author of the *Panoplia dogmatica,*[62] perhaps Pamphilius of Jerusalem. But the scholar who, in our estimation, best represents that movement and who most ably dealt with the problems involved, is Leontius of Byzantium,[63] one of the Scythian monks already mentioned, whose personal relations with Justinian enabled him to play an important rôle.

Born about the year 485, probably at Constantinople, he embraced the monastic profession at an early age and took a lively interest in the controversies of the time. He was a conscientious Chalcedonian, but well acquainted with the

μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη. They are interpreted in the Chalcedonian sense, but the Cyrillian formulas were retained. The deacon Ferrandus was better advised when he expressed the wish that the formula *μία φύσις κ.τ.λ.* be abandoned as useless or even dangerous (*P. L.*, LXVII, 889 and foll.).

[61] Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 228, 229; *P. G.*, LXXXVI, 2, col. 2104 and foll.

[62] Edited by A. Mai, *Nova Patrum bibliotheca,* Romae, 1844, II, 595–662.

[63] Of the works attributed to Leontius in *P. G.*, LXXXVI, 1, 2, only three are authentic: (1) *Libri tres contra nestorianos et eutychianos* (1, 1268–1396); (2) *Capita triginta contra Severum* (2, 1901–1906); (3) *Solutio argumentorum a Severo obiectorum* (2, 1916–1945).— Works: F. Loofs, *Leontius von Byzanz,* Leipzig, 1887. W. Ruegamer, *Leontius von Byzanz,* Würzburg, 1894. V. Ermoni, *De Leontio byzantino,* Paris, 1895. J. P. Junglas, *Leontius von Byzanz,* Paderborn, 1908.

Christology of Ephesus, and convinced that there was a perfect harmony between the definitions of the two councils. It is that harmony which he strives to illustrate, in order to put an end to the objections both of the Nestorians and the Monophysites, and bring them all back, if possible, to the unity of the Church. For that purpose he takes his inspiration from Neo-Platonism, of which he finds some traces in the works of the Fathers; he uses Porphyry, and, through Porphyry, Aristotle and his categories. But these are for him merely external helps. Above all, he is bent on reproducing the doctrine of the Fathers.[64] Philosophy serves him only to give a rational account of their thoughts.

Leontius proceeds methodically. He first gives a series of definitions, beginning with *οὐσία* (in the broad sense), which comprises all beings, created and uncreated. Under it comes the genus, *τὸ γένος*, and under the genus, the species, *τὸ εἶδος*, which is made up of the genus and the specific differences, called *εἰδοποιοὶ διαφοραί, ποιότητες οὐσιώδεις, οὐσιοποιοὶ ἰδιότητες*.[65] The being of the species is what is called *φύσις* or *οὐσία* in the strict sense. Thus human nature consists of the genus, *τὸ ζῶον εἶναι*, and the specific difference, *τὸ λογικὸν εἶναι*.[66]

Under the species we find the individual, *τὸ ἄτομον*. As the species comprises the genus and the specific differences, so the individual consists of the species and the individuating characteristics, *ἰδιώματα ἀφοριστικά*,[67] which, like Aristotle, Leontius calls *συμβεβηκότα*, because they accompany the na-

[64] *Πάντα ἐκ πατέρων λαβὼν ἔχω* (1, 1344). See the composition of his *Florilegia* in JUNGLAS, *op. cit.*, p. 24 and foll.

[65] 1, 1301 D, 1277 D; 2, 1921 CD, 1928 C.

[66] 2, 1945 B.

[67] 2, 1917 C. We may observe that these characteristics or individual accidents do not *constitute* the person; they merely serve to distinguish it externally; personality is constituted by the fact of existing apart and in itself.

ture, and yet do not belong to it; however, he distinguishes them from ordinary accidents, *συμβεβηκότα χωριστά*. The latter are merely the successive states or conditions in which a being may find itself, such as health or sickness; and, consequently, they can be separated from that being (*χωριστά*); on the contrary, the individuating characteristics, *v.g.*, the shape of the face, the color of the eyes, etc., are permanent, and determine the being which they affect in a continuous way: they are *συμβεβηκότα ἀχωριστά*.[68] Hence they stand half-way between mere accidents and specific differences, and this is why, after calling the latter *ποιότητες οὐσιώδεις*, Leontius calls the individuating characteristics *ποιότητες ἐπουσιώδεις*.[69]

The *φύσις*, then, corresponds to the species and to the *οὐσία* taken in its strict sense. As to the hypostasis, or person, the author identifies it, like the Cappadocians, with the individual or the *φύσις*, existing apart and in itself. He correctly develops the consequences that must be drawn from that concept:

"Nature implies the idea of simple being; hypostasis implies, besides, the idea of existing apart; the former signifies the species, the latter reveals the individual; the former bears the character of the universal; the latter separates what is proper from what is common.[70] . . . The notion of hypostasis, then, is realized both in those beings which, identical in their nature, differ numerically, and those which, though resulting from different natures, have a common being and *incrist* one in the other. When I say that they have a common being, I do not mean those that mutually complete each other as regards their essence, as is the case with substances and those essential predi-

[68] 1, 1945 BC.

[69] 1, 1277 D.

[70] *Ἡ μὲν γὰρ φύσις τὸν τοῦ εἶναι λόγον ἐπιδέχεται· ἡ δὲ ὑπόστασις καὶ τὸν τοῦ καθ' ἑαυτὸν εἶναι· καὶ ἡ μὲν εἴδους λόγον ἐπέχει, ἡ δὲ τοῦ τινός ἐστιν δηλωτική. Καὶ ἡ μὲν καθολικοῦ πράγματος χαρακτῆρα δηλοῖ· ἡ δὲ τοῦ κοινοῦ τὸ ἴδιον ἀποδιαστέλλεται* (1, 1280 AB; cf. 2, 1915 A).

cates that are called properties; but I have in view the nature and essence of each composing element, a nature that is not considered apart (*καθ' ἑαυτήν*), but in relation to the nature that is joined to and united with it." [71]

In this rather labored explanation Leontius means to say that, since the notion of hypostasis demands that a being exist apart (*καθ' ἑαυτόν*), it applies only to those individuals that have a physically independent existence, and not to the various parts of a whole, even though these parts may themselves be natures or substances; for they exist and subsist, not in themselves, but in the whole.

After laying down these definitions, Leontius declares that nature can exist only individually, in an individual, and therefore *hypostatised* in some way: *ἀνυπόστατος μὲν οὖν φύσις, τουτέστιν οὐσία, οὐκ ἂν εἴη ποτέ.*[72] A nature without a hypostasis is an abstraction. Whence it would seem that, since the human nature of Jesus Christ exists, it is an hypostasis. This would be a wrong conclusion, Leontius goes on to say.[73] Between *ὑπόστασις* and *ἀνυπόστατος* there is a middle state, *viz.*, *ἐνυπόστατος*, to exist, not in oneself, but in another, as a part in the whole; and this is what happens in the case of Christ's humanity: it is not *ἀνυπόστατος*, since it exists; nor an hypostasis, since it does not exist *καθ' ἑαυτήν*; but it is *ἐνυπόστατος*, since it exists in the Word to whom it belongs and who gives it the power to exist, by taking it into Himself.[74]

[71] 1, 1281 BD.
[72] 1, 1280 A.
[73] 1, 1277 D.
[74] 1, 1277 D and foll.; 2, 1944 C. In this last passage, Leontius touches on the question of the possibility of an hypostatic union between the Word and a preëxisting human person, whose hypostasis or personality would have been destroyed through that union. He declares himself for the affirmative.— Regarding the origin and history of the word *ἐνυπόστατος*, cf. JUNGLAS, *op. cit.*, p. 150 and foll.

Is such a mode of existence, an *enhypostatising*[75] of the humanity, possible? Leontius endeavors to prove that it is possible by showing that nature presents analogous instances. Thus, the specific and individuating characteristics, *ποιότητες οὐσιώδεις* or *ἐπουσιώδεις*, have a like mode of existence, since, on the one hand, they are not mere accidents, and, on the other, not subsisting natures (*πράγματα ὑφεστῶσα*).[76] The same thing takes place whenever two elements, although united, preserve each its own nature, for instance, in the union of body and soul.[77] However, Leontius realizes that these are mere comparisons which but imperfectly resemble a fact that is absolutely unique.[78]

At all events, it is easy to see how advantageously Leontius could employ his theory of the *ἐνυπόστατον* against the Nestorian and the Monophysite heresies, which contradicted each other. Since to be *φύσις* was not necessarily to be *ὑπόστασις* and *πρόσωπον*, the Nestorians were wrong in inferring from the duality of natures in Christ a duality of persons and hypostases; while the Monophysites were equally in error when they inferred from the unity of hypostasis and person a unity of nature. The author told the Nestorians that while it is true indeed that the Word *τέλειος* has assumed a complete humanity, *τέλεια*, these two elements, though complete and perfect in themselves, considered in regard to the Incarnate Word whose elements they are, constitute only incomplete parts, like the body and the soul in man.[79] Hence

[75] Leontius defines it thus: *Τὸ δὲ ἐνυπόστατον τὸ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὸ συμβεβηκὸς δηλοῖ, ὃ ἐν ἑτέρῳ ἔχει τὸ εἶναι, καὶ οὐκ ἐν ἑαυτῷ θεωρεῖτοι.* To be enhypostatised is peculiar to a being that is not an accident, and yet exists, not in itself, but in another (1, 1277 D).

[76] 1, 1277 D.

[77] 1, 1280 B, 1304 BC.

[78] 1, 1280 D.

[79] *Οὐδὲ ὁ Λόγος τέλειος Χριστὸς, κἂν τέλειος εἴη θεὸς, μὴ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος αὐτῷ συντεταγμένης· οὔτε ἡ ψυχὴ τέλειος ἄνθρωπος, κἂν τελείαν ἔχει οὐσίαν, μὴ τοῦ σώματος αὐτῇ συνεπινοουμένου* (1, 1289). Here Leontius strains

there is in Christ one person only. Leontius begged the Monophysites, and especially the Severians, to observe that, if the specific characters of the human nature, τὸ λογικὸν καὶ φθαρτὸν εἶναι, were found in Jesus Christ, as they granted, it must be admitted that there was in Him a human φύσις, and therefore two natures.[80] Let no one object that, since body and soul united in man form but one nature, there must be but one nature in the God-man. The result of the union between body and soul is not merely an individual, τὶς ἄνθρωπος; it is a species, a characterized φύσις, a nature in which several individuals can participate; and since we can ascribe to each individual what belongs to the nature or species, we can say of each man that he is μία φύσις, even though body and soul preserve in each their ἰδιότης. But in Jesus Christ the case is different. The result of the union in Him is not a *Christic* nature, χριστότης, εἶδος χριστῶν, capable of being participated in; it is necessarily one individual, one only and incommunicable hypostasis. He is not, then, μία φύσις, He is μία ὑπόστασις.[81] There are, Leontius adds, only three cases where we can speak of μία φύσις: (1) relatively to the species; (2) relatively to the individual, inasmuch as he participates in the species; (3) when out of two natures there arises, by mixture, a third nature, different from the other two, ἐξ ἑτεροειδῶν ἑτεροειδές. The case of Christ belongs to none of these categories.[82]

There still remained the last argument of Severus, to wit: if we admit two natures in Christ, we must admit two ἐνέργειαι, which would lead to the assumption of two persons. This difficulty does not seem to have impressed Leontius.

a point. The Logos ἄσαρκος is not the whole Christ, nor, strictly speaking, a part of Christ, for He is not perfected by the union, and consequently preserves His personality.

[80] I, 1317 D — 1320 A.

[81] I, 1289 B — 1292 B.

[82] I, 1292 BC.

Since each nature retains its *ἰδιώματα*, he says, it is quite proper that it should also retain its *ἐνέργειαι*, which are merely its real properties or faculties in action.[83] Leontius therefore rejects the *διαίρεσις καθ' ἐνέργειαν*, that would imply a separation of natures;[84] but he also rejects the *ἕνωσις καθ' ἐνέργειαν* and the Severian formula, *τὰς φύσεις μόνῃ τῇ ἐπινοίᾳ θεωροῦμεν*, which implies objective unity of nature in Jesus Christ.[85] However, he defends the expression used by some Fathers, *τὴν τῶν φύσεων διαίρεσιν καθ' ἐπίνοιαν λαμβάνειν*, because it refers not to the distinction but to the separation of the natures.[86]

Hence we can say that Leontius upholds absolutely the doctrine of Chalcedon, merely striving to reconcile it with the Cyrillian formulas. That this is his purpose can be seen both from the formulas of the Scythian monks, whom he patronizes, and from other expressions which he uses despite their heterodoxy. He condemns the term *ἕνωσις συγχυτική*,[87] but approves *ἕνωσις κατ' οὐσίαν*, *ἕνωσις οὐσιώδης*, which of course is synonymous with the *ἕνωσις φυσική* of St. Cyril, and which he understands in the sense of *ἕνωσις καθ' ὑπόστασιν*,[88] since the only ground he gives for its legitimacy is the *communicatio idiomatum*, *ἀντίδοσις τῶν ἰδιωμάτων*.[89] The formula *μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη* is also approved and defended in numbers 16 and 17 of the *Capita triginta contra Severum*.[90]

Bearing all this in mind, we can safely conclude that Leontius of Byzantium was *the* theologian of his time. He embraced Justinian's policy and strove to serve it by facilitating the dissenters' return to the Church and solving, as far as he could, the theological difficulties which they raised against the true doctrine. It can rightly be said that with

[83] 1, 1320 AB; cf. 2, 1932 C.
[84] 2, 1932 C, 1933 B.
[85] 2, 1929 D — 1932 D.
[86] 2, 1932 C; cf. 1937 C.
[87] 2, 1940 C — 1941 A.
[88] 1, 1297 D — 1300 A, 1304 B.
[89] *V. g.*, 1, 1305 C.
[90] 2, 1905.

Leontius the notion of personality, considered from the physical point of view, became fully determined, and that the problem of its relations to nature in Jesus Christ received, if not an adequate solution as to substance, at least some sort of an explanation couched in accurate and definite terminology. This was a distinct and permanent advance, to be sanctioned two centuries later by St. John Damascene, who defended the same ideas, and often employed the same formulas as Leontius.

CHAPTER VI

MONOTHELITISM. DEFINITION OF THE DUALITY OF WILLS AND OPERATIONS IN CHRIST [1]

§ 1. The Beginnings of Monothelitism to the Publication of the Ecthesis (619-638).

We have seen in the preceding chapter how Justinian's desire of effecting the religious reunion of the Empire had led to the episode of the Three Chapters. A similar desire originated and fed for sixty years another dispute, that of Monothelitism. Not that the question of one or two operations, one or two wills in Christ was altogether new. The reader may recall that Severus, basing his assertion on St. Cyril and the Pseudo-Areopagite, had expressly declared himself in favor of the oneness of operation and will. To Leontius of Byzantium, on the contrary, the duality of wills and operations seemed to be a consequence following from the duality of natures. This had been the opinion also of Ephrem of Antioch,[2] the monk Eustathius,[3] and John of Scythopolis.[4] About the year 600, people at Alexandria al-

[1] Sources: The original documents, in Mansi, X, XI, and the Greek and Latin *Patrologies* in the volumes indicated. Cf. especially Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des conciles,* III, 1 (*History of the Councils,* vols. IV and V). G. Owsepian, *Die Entstehungsgeschichte des Monothelismus,* Leipzig, 1897. G. Krueger, Artic. *Monotheleten,* in *Realencyklop. für protest. Theologie,* XIII. J. Pargoire, *L'Eglise byzantine de* 527 *à* 847, Paris, 1905. A. Chillet, *Le monothélisme, exposé et critique,* Brignais, 1911.

[2] *P. G.,* LXXXVI, *2,* col. 2105.

[3] *Epist. de duab. naturis, ibid.,* col. 909 B.

[4] *Doctrina Patrum,* Diekamp, p. 85 and foll.

ready talked of μία ἐνέργεια and μία θέλησις, and the patriarch Eulogius (580–607) refuted these errors.[5] But it is probable that, had the controversy remained within the field of theology, it would have been regarded merely as an incident of the Monophysite discussion. Political circumstances gave it an unexpected importance.

Heraclius had to defend the empire against the Persians and the Arabs,[6] and so deep was the mutual hatred among Christians in the provinces where the Monophysites had the upper hand, that the Emperor had reason to fear that the dissenters would hail the invaders instead of repelling them. It was, then, of the utmost importance to find a formula of conciliation on which orthodox and heretics could agree and thereby to restore religious peace and seal the union of all against the common foe. The Emperor thought he had found it in the formula of one operation in Christ. A man who was devoted to him and whom he fully trusted, Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, was to help him to get it accepted by all.

Sergius had probably indulged the same hope. A series of conferences and letters succeeded one another with a view to realize the plan. As early as 619, Sergius asked George Arsas, a Paulianist of Alexandria, to send him the texts of the Fathers that speak of one ἐνέργεια in Christ, to enable him to base the reunion of the Paulianists with the Church on that formula.[7] In 622, during his Armenian campaign, Heraclius conferred at Theodosiopolis with Paul the Severian (the one-eyed) and tried unsuccessfully to win him over to Monenergism.[8] In 626, on the occasion of an expedition

[5] In his treatise Περὶ τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος καὶ περὶ τῆς θείας οἰκονομίας, of which an important fragment has been edited by O. BARDENHEWER, in *Theologische Quartalschrift*, 78 (1896), p. 353–401; cf. p. 372, 374, 375.

[6] Against the latter after 634.

[7] *P. G.*, XCI, 333. The Paulianists were a Monophysite party.

[8] MANSI, XI, 529.

in Lazia, the Emperor again insisted on Monenergism with the metropolitan, Cyrus of Phasis. Cyrus questioned the legitimacy of the expression *μία ἐνέργεια*. St. Leo's letter seemed to him very explicit on that point. However, at the Emperor's command, he writes to Sergius to ascertain whether or not he must admit in Christ, after the union, *μίαν ἡγουμενικὴν ἐνέργειαν*.[9] Sergius reassures him, and sends him a letter from Mennas, one of his predecessors, to Vigilius, containing several testimonies from the Fathers *περὶ μιᾶς ἐνεργείας καὶ ἑνὸς θελήματος τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ*.[10] Cyrus was won over. This was also the case some time after with the bishop of Pharan in Arabia, Theodore, to whom Sergius forwarded a copy of Mennas' letter. Thus was gradually formed a nucleus of Monothelites.

Soon they had an opportunity to show their colors. When the patriarchate of Alexandria became vacant, in 631, Heraclius had Cyrus of Phasis appointed thereto, with the special commission of effecting a reunion with the Egyptian Monophysites. Cyrus pursued this task with zeal. He brought back to the Church the Theodosians, also called Phthartolatri, with their ministers, personages of mark and several thousand people, and, on June 3, 633, celebrated with them the sacred mysteries.[11] The reunion was based on a formulary of nine anathematisms that had been drawn up by the two parties.[12] Whilst the Monophysite doctrine was not approved, the Monophysite terminology was reproduced as closely as possible. The union in Jesus Christ is *φυσική τε καὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν* (IV); Jesus Christ is *ἐκ δύο φύσεων*: He is one only synthetic hypostasis, *μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη*,

[9] Mansi, XI, 560, 561.

[10] Mansi, XI, 529, 532. The authenticity of this letter was contested by the legates in the 6th General Council, A. D. 680. It may have been forged by Sergius himself.

[11] *Epist. Cyri ad Sergium*, Mansi, XI, 561, 564.

[12] Mansi, XI, 564–568; Hahn, § 232.

σύνθετος (VI). The seventh anathematism defined Monenergism; it condemned whoever denied " that there was but one and the same Christ, working both the divine and the human actions by one theandrical operation, as St. Denys teaches,[13] the elements out of which the union is made being distinguished only through the consideration of the mind and the discerning of the intelligence."

The agreement thus effected was triumphantly announced by Cyrus to the Emperor and to Sergius. The latter in his reply,[14] congratulated his colleague and approved the anathematisms, especially the seventh: *πᾶσα γὰρ θειά τε καὶ ἀνθρωπίνη ἐνέργεια*, he said, *ἐξ ἑνὸς καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ σεσαρκωμένου Λόγου προήρχετο*: and added that this was St. Leo's teaching in the famous passage: *ἐνεργεῖ ἑκατέρᾳ μορφῇ μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοινωνίας*. We may observe that in this quotation, the ablative *ἑκατέρᾳ μορφῇ* is put for the nominative " agit utraque forma," which, of course, modifies the sense. At all events, if the imperial party was triumphant, the Monophysites also were victorious. In their eyes, the recognition of one operation was equivalent to the recognition of one nature in Christ.[15]

This first victory of the Monothelites was soon followed by two others. A reunion, which unfortunately proved shortlived, was concluded with the dissenting Armenians; and, on condition that he would acknowledge his legitimacy, the Emperor won over to his side the Monophysite patriarch of Antioch, Anastasius.

Thus, everything seemed to prosper with the new teaching and its followers. However, an opposition had arisen, which Sergius immediately gauged at its true value. At

[13] *Ἐνεργοῦντα τὰ θεοπρεπῆ καὶ ἀνθρώπινα μιᾷ θεανδρικῇ ἐνεργείᾳ κατὰ τὸν ἐν ἁγίοις Διονύσιον*. The word *ἐνέργεια*, in Latin *operatio*, does not signify in this controversy the energy or active force, but the act itself, the operation, *τὸ ἐνεργεῖν*.

[14] Mansi, X, 973–976.

[15] *Vita Maximi, P. G.*, XC, 77.

the time of the union with the Theodosians, two monks, Sophronius and Maximus, were in Egypt. The former, on becoming acquainted with the nine anathematisms of the year 633, realized their venom and entreated Cyrus to renounce them.[16] As he did not succeed, he went to see Sergius for the same purpose, but without success. We are told by Sergius[17] that he even persuaded Sophronius to speak neither of one nor of two operations in Jesus Christ, but to abide by the universally accepted doctrine of two natures and one person working both the divine and the human things. Sergius wrote in this sense to Cyrus, and Sophronius returned to Palestine. Towards the end of the same year, 633, or at the beginning of 634, Sophronius was elected patriarch of Jerusalem. This appointment changed his doctrinal position: he who, until then, had been one of the faithful, became a judge of the faith; he regarded silence as a denial. Probably on the occasion of his instalment (634), he held a synod at Jerusalem which defined the doctrine of the two operations and the two wills (*δύο θελήσεις καὶ ἐνεργείας*),[17a] and sent his synodal letter on the same subject to Pope Honorius, Sergius, and the other patriarchs.[18]

This important letter may be divided into three parts. The first (col. 465–472) is concerned with the Trinity. The second takes up the Christological question. Sophronius first expounds the doctrine of the unity of person and the duality of natures, then comes to the problem of the operations. In his eyes, the duality of the operations in Christ results

[16] Mansi, X, 691; XI, 532.

[17] Sergius' letter to Honorius, Mansi, XI, 533, 536.

[17a] Mansi, X, 607.

[18] It is given in Mansi, XI, 461–509, and in *P. G.*, LXXXVII, 3, col. 3148–3200. Cf. Hahn, § 233. The columns referred to in the text are those of Mansi's work (Cf. also Hefele, *Hist. of the Councils,* vol. V, p. 43 and foll.).

from the duality of natures and from the permanence of their properties. "As in Christ each nature preserves its property inviolate, so each form works, in communion with the other, what is proper to itself" (col. 480). Since the being of the natures is distinct, the operations are also distinct, and we refrain carefully from holding that these natures have only one essential and physical operation, lest we be led to fuse them into one nature (col. 481). For it is by means of operations, philosophers say, that natures are discerned, and it is the difference of operations that enables us to realize the diversity of substances (col. 484). As to that theandrical operation spoken of by Dionysius, it must be observed that he does not present it as the *only operation* in Jesus Christ, but as a new operation (καινὴν . . . ἑτερογενεῖ καὶ διάφορον), added to the two others, comprising the actions in which the divinity and the humanity are exercised at the same time (col. 488).

However, whilst asserting that there are in Jesus Christ two operations, Sophronius asserts just as emphatically that there is in Him but one working agent: "We maintain that all the speech and energy [activity, action] of Christ, whether divine and heavenly, or human and earthly, proceed from one and the same Christ and Son, from the one compound and unique hypostasis which is the incarnate Logos of God, who brings forth naturally from Himself both energies unseparated and unmixed, according to His natures: according to His divine nature, by which He is consubstantial with the Father, the divine and ineffable energy; according to His human nature, by which He became consubstantial with us men, the human and earthly: the energy being in accordance with the nature to which it belongs" (col. 484; cf. 480).

It is remarkable that Sophronius, who so plainly proclaims two operations in Christ, nowhere speaks of two wills; and

yet he knew what Sergius thought on the latter point. But as yet the controversy had not drifted to that particular subject, and it cannot be inferred from his silence (as Dorner does) that the Patriarch of Jerusalem held that there is in Jesus, over and above two operations, one hypostatic will. He merely observed that Jesus Christ did not undergo necessarily and unwillingly (ἀκουσίως ἢ ἀναγκαστῶς) the motions and passions of human nature, even though He underwent them naturally and humanly (φυσικῶς καὶ ἀνθρωπίνως, col. 484 and foll.). This is not the same as saying that the human activity and will were ruled and moved *only* by the one divine will.

The third part of Sophronius' letter (col. 489–509) dealt with several questions foreign to our subject and which it is useless to discuss here. We merely note the full acceptation of all the letters of St. Leo "as coming from the lips of St. Peter, the choir-leader of the Apostles" (col. 497).

These are the main points of that long document, written in a bombastic and diffuse style,— the first protest against the Monothelite error.

Sergius had probably foreseen its publication, for, even before it was published, he had done his best to forestall any condemnation on the part of Rome,— a policy which he had more than one reason to adopt. The papal see was at that time held by Honorius (October 27, 625–638). It was of the utmost importance, if something lasting was to be accomplished, to have him on one's side. Hence, no sooner had Sophronius been elected patriarch, than Sergius wrote to Honorius a letter from which we have borrowed many a detail to describe the origin of this controversy.[19] After recalling the events we have related, till his interview with Sophronius at Constantinople, Sergius went on to make a perfidious plea in behalf of Monothelitism, although he ap-

[19] The text in MANSI, XI, 529–537

parently wished nothing more than that silence be kept on these questions. After his conference with Sophronius, he said, he had written to Cyrus of Alexandria and advised him to speak neither of one operation, since that expression, although used by some Fathers, was offensive to certain persons, nor of two operations, since this was deemed a novelty and scandalized many. Moreover, to admit two operations would lead one to assume in Jesus Christ two wills contrary to each other, which is ungodly (*ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ ἕπεσθαι ταύτῃ τὸ, καὶ δύο πρεσβεύειν θελήματα ἐναντίως πρὸς ἄλληλα ἔχοντι*, col. 533). What the Fathers really teach, is that the humanity of Jesus Christ, far from ever experiencing any motion contrary to the will of the Word who was united to it, always performed its natural operation, just when and how and inasmuch as the Word willed (*τὴν φυσικὴν αὐτῆς ποιήσασθαι κίνησιν ὁπότε, καὶ οἵαν, καὶ ὅσην αὐτὸς ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος ἠβούλετο*, col. 536); that Christ's humanity was, in reference to the Word, exactly what our body is in reference to the soul, which rules (*ἡγεμονεύεται*), adorns, and orders it at its pleasure. Likewise, the humanity in Jesus Christ was at all times and in all things moved and directed by the divinity of the Word (*ὑπὸ τῆς αὐτοῦ τοῦ Λόγου θεότητος ἀεὶ καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγόμενον θεοκίνητον ἦν*, col. 536). And yet, Sergius goes on to say, we have preferred to leave aside these discussions and abide by the ordinary language of the Fathers. This is precisely what Sophronius has promised to do, and what we have suggested to the Emperor, when forwarding to him the utterances of the Fathers about one operation and one will, contained in Mennas' letter to Vigilius. We have advised him simply to confess "that one and the same only begotten Son of God, equally true God and true man, works both the divine and the human, and that from one and the same Incarnate Word all divine and human energy proceeds indivisibly and inseparably" (col. 537). This has been taught by St. Leo in his "Agit

enim utraque forma cum alterius communione quod proprium est."

The policy of silence as regards the new question could not but extremely gratify a Roman like Honorius. He fell into the snare that had been laid for him by Sergius. We have two letters of his to the Patriarch of Constantinople, which have given rise to many discussions and demand a careful analysis.

The first [20] is an immediate answer to Sergius' letter. (The Pope had not yet received Sophronius' letter.) His answer to Sergius, written in a rather obscure style, may be summed up in the three following points: (1) One must avoid speaking of one or two operations; these are new disputes about words, that scandalize the simple. If we speak of two operations, we shall be regarded as Nestorians; if we speak of one operation only, we shall be regarded as Eutychians. We know from Scripture that Jesus Christ is the one working agent of the divinity and the humanity; that He worked in a great many ways; but neither the Apostles nor the councils have spoken of one or two operations; and to decide whether it is opportune to assert one or two operations, is not our business, but that of the grammarians and philosophers. Let, then, nothing be said on the subject, or, at least, if anyone likes to discuss it, let him not exalt his opinion into an article of faith.— (2) This much must be held: Jesus Christ, who is one person, has performed both the divine and the human works through the concourse of the two natures; the same Jesus Christ has worked in His two natures both divinely and humanly.— (3) We must hold the unity of Christ's will; for, whilst the Word truly

[20] We have no longer the Latin original, but a Greek translation that was pronounced accurate by the 6th general Council. (Mansi, XI, 537–544.) The Latin text given by Mansi and Migne (*P. L.*, XL, 470–474) represents an old Latin translation from the Greek.

took our nature, He did not take our vitiated nature; He took our flesh, but not the law of the flesh which is repugnant to that of the spirit. There was not, then, in Jesus Christ, a will tending in a direction differing from the law of the spirit, or contrary to it (*διάφορον ἢ ἐναντίον θέλημα*); and the words, *I came down from heaven, not to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me* (*Ioan.*, VI, 38), and, *Father, not what I will, but what thou wilt* (*Marc.*, XIV, 36), do not mark a will differing [from that of the Father], but merely the economy of the humanity which He had assumed (*οὐκ εἰσὶ ταῦτα διαφόρου θελήματος, ἀλλὰ τῆς οἰκονομίας τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος τῆς προσληφθείσης*). These words were spoken for our instruction, in order that, imitating our Master's example, everyone of us may prefer the divine will to his own.

The second letter of Honorius, of which only a few fragments have been preserved,[21] is posterior to Sophronius' synodal letter, and seems to reprove certain excessive statements contained therein. It reproduces fairly the thoughts of the first letter. The Pope again expresses the wish that no mention of one or two operations in Christ be made from the pulpits. The existence of two natures in Jesus Christ is evident from the Scriptures; but it is foolish (*πάνυ μάταιον*) to speak of one or two operations in the mediator Jesus. In the second fragment, Honorius briefly touches upon the true doctrine in reproducing St. Leo's formula: each of the two natures, united to the other through a natural union, and in communion with it, operates and is operating, the divine nature performing what is from God, and the human performing what is from the body, without division, confusion, or conversion. And yet the Pope concludes that, instead of speaking of one or two operations, we had better speak of one operator and two operating natures. Honorius added

[21] The Greek-Latin text is given in Mansi, XI, 579–582; the Latin, in *P. L.*, XL, 474, 475.

that he was writing in the same sense to Cyrus and Sophronius, and that the latter's delegates had assured him that the Patriarch of Jerusalem would cease speaking of two operations, on condition that the Patriarch of Alexandria would consent to speak no longer of one operation.

These two letters could not but encourage Sergius to persevere in carrying out his plan. However, as it was important to palliate the effect produced by Sophronius' sudden declaration, he prepared, in 636, and got the Emperor to sign, in 638, an edict that had for its purpose to define the attitude to be observed in these questions. This is the famous *Ecthesis.*

The Ecthesis [22] is a profession of faith. After explaining the doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation in general, it comes to the subject of the operations and wills in Jesus Christ. Every operation, whether divine or human, must be ascribed solely to the Word Incarnate; but we must avoid saying or teaching that there are one or two operations; it would be better to say that there is but one Jesus Christ, who works both divine and human effects. The expression *one operation* is offensive to several, because they regard it as a sort of subterfuge tending to Monophysitism; on the other hand, the expression *two operations,* which has previously been unheard of, scandalizes many, because it leads to the admission of two contrary wills in Jesus Christ. "Therefore," the Ecthesis concludes, "we, following the holy Fathers in everything, and also in this, confess one will of our Lord Jesus Christ, the true God, for at no time did His rationally quickened flesh, separately and of its own impulse, and in opposition to the suggestion of the hypostatically united Logos, exercise its natural activity, but it exercised that activity at the time and in the manner and measure

[22] Cf. the text in MANSI, X, 992–997. An extract is given in HAHN, § 234.

in which the Word God willed it." [23] The document ends with an exhortation to all Christians to accept, without change, this exposition of the faith.

In the East the Ecthesis was accepted by most of the bishops. Sophronius of Jerusalem had died and been replaced by a Monothelite, Sergius of Joppe; Macedonius of Antioch and Cyrus of Alexandria favored the Emperor's views. Two councils held at Constantinople, one by Sergius between September and December 638,[24] the other by his successor, Pyrrhus, in the year 639, approved the Ecthesis, and condemned all who professed one or two operations.[25] No opposition could come from the East, where the most flagrantly abusive imperial decrees were always slavishly accepted by the episcopate. But opposition came from Rome and the West. Honorius had died on October 12, 638, and his successors looked into all these questions more closely than he did.

Before relating briefly the main phases of the struggle that now began, we will place before the reader an accurate exposition of the Monothelite teaching. This teaching is rather confused and can hardly be understood without some previous explanations.

Orthodox Christology holds that the Divine Logos so united the human nature to Himself as to appropriate it to Himself and make it His own. Hence the actions and passions of that nature are referred to Him, as to the center of imputability; it is the Word Incarnate who acts and

[23] "Εν θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀληθινοῦ θεοῦ ὁμολογοῦμεν, ὡς ἐν μεδενὶ καιρῷ τῆς νοερῶς ἐψυχομένης αὐτοῦ σαρκὸς κεχωρισμένως καὶ ἐξ οἰκείας ὁρμῆς ἐναντίως τῷ νεύματι τοῦ ἡνωμένου αὐτῇ καθ' ὑπόστασιν θεοῦ Λόγου, τὴν φυσικὴν αὐτῆς ποιήσασθαι κίνησιν, ἀλλ' ὁπότε, καὶ οἷαν καὶ ὅσην αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς Λόγος ἠβούλετο (996 C). Cf. Hefele, *History of the Councils*, vol. V, p. 63–64.

[24] Sergius died on December 8 or 9, 638.

[25] Mansi, X, 1000, 1001, 1004.

suffers in that nature and through it. But this must be carefully circumscribed. The human nature is not, in the hands of the Word, what an instrument is in the hands of an active principle, an ax, for instance, in the hands of a workman. For the personality, taken apart from the nature, has in itself no activity and is not a dynamic principle; it is a mere mode of being of the nature, the mode of existing apart by itself and constituting one independent physical whole. The personality is a *condition* necessary in order that the nature may exercise its activity, for an ἀνυπόστατος nature can neither exist nor act; but the personality does not set that activity a-going. The actions and passions of the nature are referred to the person, not because the personality taken by itself is the main effective cause thereof, but because the concrete person comprises both the nature and the personality, *i.e.*, expresses the whole to which the actions and passions of the nature — a part improperly so called of that whole — must be referred.

Therefore, when we say that the Word Incarnate acts and suffers in and through His human nature, what do we mean? Simply that the human nature, which exists in the Word as in its hypostasis or personality, acts and suffers, and that these actions and passions are rightly attributed to the concrete whole, to the person of the Incarnate Word. The same reasoning holds in regard to the divine nature of the Word, and thus we see that the divine and human activities and operations of Jesus Christ must be considered as forming two *parallel*[26] series, both of which have indeed the condition of their existence in the personality of the Word, but proceed from each of the two natures as from their true efficient principle.[27] These series, I say, are

[26] The word *parallel* must not be taken here in the strict geometrical sense, since the two series have a common meeting-point in the Word; the following remarks sufficiently illustrate my meaning.

[27] This is really what St. Leo meant to say in the famous phrase:

parallel, and not *subordinate:* the human activity is not physically subordinate to the divine activity, because it is not the divine *nature,* but the *person* of the Word, a mere subsisting relation, that has made the humanity its own. If, then, there is a harmony between these two activities, when exercised, that harmony is not obtained mechanically, as it were, but results from the free and spontaneous consent of the man ordering his resolutions and actions in conformity with the divine will and actions.

These principles were altogether forgotten or purposely ignored by the Monothelites. Under the influence of Severian Monophysitism, which insisted always and everywhere on the person of the Word, or of Eutychian Monophysitism, which sublimated the human nature into the divine nature of Jesus Christ, and also, if we go back still further, under the influence of Apollinarianism, according to which Christ's humanity, being deprived of a human soul, was but a useless organ in the hands of His divine nature, the Monothelites regarded the person of the Word as an active principle moving the human nature at its will, or making the latter, through the ἰδιοποίησις, a property of the divine *nature.* The two activities — divine and human — are not exercised *coördinately,* but the human is *subordinate* to the divine, and, to use Sergius' words, is exercised only "when and how and inasmuch as the divine Word wills."

This dependence, however, may be conceived more or less absolutely, and the question is how the Monothelites understood it.

It may be assumed that the human faculties, including the

"Agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione quod proprium est." The word *forma* has the drawback of being abstract, but it shows aptly that the natures are, in Jesus Christ, the active principles. The activity of each nature is exercised "cum alterius communione," because the two natures are united in the Word.

will, no longer perform any spontaneous acts, but only act at the command and under the impulse of the divine will, which moves them and applies them to action, while the human will, which is also moved, merely transmits the divine impulse to the other faculties. The human will being thus reduced to a passive state, there is in Christ but one will, *ἓν θέλημα*, the divine or hypostatic *θέλημα*, and only one operation, *μία ἐνέργεια*, if considered in its primary source.

There is no doubt that this error was professed by Sergius and his partisans. From the way in which the letter of Sergius to Honorius, the Ecthesis, and the letter of Paul of Constantinople to Pope Theodore represent Christ's humanity, as having appropriated the *θέλημα θεῖον καὶ ἀδιάφορον* of the Word, as being *ὑπ' αὐτοῦ* (Λόγου) *διὰ παντὸς, ἐν πᾶσιν, ἀγομένη τε καὶ κινουμένη*, and consequently *θεοκίνητος*; as not exercising its own activity (*φυσικὴν κίνησιν*) independently of the Word and without His impulse, but only *ὁπότε, καὶ οἵαν, καὶ ὅσην ὁ θεὸς Λόγος ἠβούλετο*, it is evident that these authors denied in Jesus Christ, as man, all spontaneity and free-will action. Macarius asserted this expressly in the 6th general Council, when, on being asked if he admitted two natural wills and operations in Jesus Christ, he replied: *Οὐ λέγω δύο φυσικὰ θελήματα ἢ δύο ἐνεργείας φυσικὰς ἐπὶ τῆς ἐνσάρκου οἰκονομίας τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀλλ' ἓν θέλημα καὶ θεανδρικὴν ἐνέργειαν.*[28]

The question may be solved in a still more radical way by denying to the humanity of Jesus Christ any capacity of its own to act, making it a mere inert substance in which the divine activity is diffused and exercised almost as the human body receives its life and motion from the soul. The dynamic principle is one, and therefore the *ἐνέργεια*, the action and operation of that principle, is one also. This

[28] MANSI, XI, 345 E.

view is called *Monenergism.* It seems that many Monothelites rejected this radical explanation of the unity of operation in Jesus Christ. It has been remarked that, except at the very beginning, Sergius, whilst insisting on the unity of will, merely demands that nothing be said either of the unity or the duality of the *ἐνέργεια*; moreover, he does not seem to have denied, in the humanity of Jesus Christ, the existence of natural faculties capable of acting. It is probable, however, that several of his partisans did not imitate his reserve.[29] In fact, Apollinarianism, from which Monothelitism evidently springs, had taught that in Jesus Christ the Word was the strength, the energy, the mover, whereas the humanity, or rather the body, was the passive element, that which was moved, the organ. Fragments 107 and 117 of Apollinaris' works[30] are quite plain in this regard: *θεὸς ἀναλαβὼν ὄργανον καὶ θεός ἐστι καθὸ ἐνεργεῖ, καὶ ἄνθρωπος κατὰ τὸ ὄργανον. Μένων δὲ θεὸς οὐ μεταβέβληται. Ὄργανον καὶ τὸ κινοῦν μίαν πέφυκεν ἀποτελεῖν τὴν ἐνέργειαν.*[31] The same teaching is also found in the writings of Theodore of Pharan: *Εἶναι μίαν γινώσκειν ἐνέργειαν, ταύτης δὲ τεχνίτην καὶ δημιουργὸν τὸν θεὸν Λόγον· ὄργανον δὲ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα.*[32] Besides, the comparison of the union of the divine and human elements in Christ with that of the body and soul in man, on which the Monothelites insisted, led naturally to this conclusion, and in fact many must have drawn it.

There is a third way to conceive the unity of operation and will in Jesus Christ, *viz.,* by considering all His acts as proceeding from one mixed theandric nature, and sharing

[29] This is the opinion of Petau, *De incarnatione,* VIII, cap. 4–6, and A. Chillet, *op. cit.*

[30] Edit. Lietzmann, p. 232, 235. Cf. the 2d vol. of this *History of Dogmas,* p. 100.

[31] Fragm. 117. This fragment was read in the eleventh session of the 6th general Council, Mansi, XI, 449 DE.

[32] Mansi, X, 961 D.

the theandric character of the same. Some Eutychians may have thus understood the ἐνέργεια θεανδρική of Pseudo-Dionysius; but that was not the case with most Monothelites.

This, then, was the exact meaning of the formulas put forth by Sergius and the Emperor to win over the Monophysites: there is in Jesus Christ only one will and one truly spontaneous and free activity, the divine activity and will. Granting the existence of a human nature, its activity is completely subordinate to that of the divine; the humanity in the hands of the Logos is merely a docile instrument which He uses and which is devoid of any initiative of its own.

It is against this false concept of Christ's humanity that orthodox theologians took up the cudgels.

§ 2. The Dyothelite Reaction up to the Lateran Council of 649.

Pope Honorius, as we have noted, died October 12, 638. His successor, Severinus, who ruled only two months, may have had time enough to condemn Monothelitism.[33] At any rate, John IV, who replaced him, had it condemned by a council held at Rome in January, 641,[34] and conveyed the sentence to Heraclius.[35] The latter died on February 11 of the same year, leaving the throne to his two sons, Heraclius Constantine and Heracleon. The Pope profited by this opportunity to send to them almost immediately an important letter explaining the true doctrine and asserting the orthodoxy of Pope Honorius.[36] He said that after Sergius had informed Honorius that some taught the existence of

[33] Hefele-Leclercq. *Hist. des conc.*, III, 1, p. 392 (*Hist. of the Councils*, vol. V, p. 66–67).

[34] Mansi, X, 607–610.

[35] In his answer, of which a few fragments are still extant, Heraclius affirmed that the Ecthesis was not his work, but that of Sergius (Mansi, XI, 9).

[36] Mansi, X, 682–686, and *P. L.*, LXXX, 602–607. The letter is dated from the year 641.

two contrary wills in Jesus Christ, the Pope had justly condemned that error. Man, who is born in sin and experiences the law of the flesh, has two opposing wills: *duas autem dico mentis et carnis invicem reluctantes;* but this is not the case with Jesus Christ, who was born innocent and without concupiscence: in His sacred humanity there was but one *human* will; and this was precisely what Honorius had meant to say. Instead, the Patriarch Pyrrhus and his followers represent him as attributing to Jesus Christ only one will, common both to the divinity and the humanity. This is a misrepresentation;[37] and besides, that view cannot be upheld. The unity of will would imply that either the Savior's divinity or His humanity is incomplete, according as one admits that that will is human or divine, or that the two natures are but one nature, should one admit that the only will and operation come both from the divinity and the humanity. In conclusion, the Pope asked the emperors to withdraw the Ecthesis.

It is difficult to ascertain the impression this letter created at Constantinople: several changes, which brought successively new actors on the scene of events, took place unexpectedly. Heraclius Constantine died that same year (641); Heracleon was overthrown, and the imperial power fell into the hands of his nephew, Constans II. The patriarch Pyrrhus, who was implicated in the revolution, fled to Africa, and, although he had not handed in his resignation, was succeeded by a priest of Constantinople, Paul II (October

[37] The reader will observe that John IV defends Honorius only on the subject of the unity of the will. He does not extenuate his predecessor's prohibition to speak of one or two operations, nor his assertion that Holy Writ teaches nothing on the subject. Moreover, he sees in the text of Honorius the assertion of one *human* will in Jesus Christ. Honorius had in fact insisted upon the absence of concupiscence in Jesus Christ, but his conclusion was that, likewise, there was in Him but one divine and human will *as regards the willed object.* In truth, Honorius needed no defence on this last point.

1, 641). Pope John IV died, October 12, 642, and Theodore was elected in his stead (November 24, 642). But the papal policy remained the same. In answer to Paul's letters of communion, Theodore replied[38] by again condemning the Ecthesis — which Constans II had already withdrawn,— bidding the Patriarch remark that his canonical status was irregular, and calling upon him to take an unequivocal doctrinal attitude. His entreaties were useless. Whilst Pyrrhus was holding the celebrated conference against the abbot Maximus in Africa, July 645, from which the latter came off victorious,[39] and whilst, after that victory, several councils held in Africa energetically combated Monothelitism,[40] Paul of Constantinople, in replying, in 647, to new entreaties on the part of the Pope, merely reproduced, though with still greater insistence, the doctrine of the Ecthesis.[41] Every operation, whether divine or human, comes from the Word incarnate only. There is in Jesus Christ only one will; to deny this would be to postulate in Him two contrary wills and two persons. Moreover, His humanity has appropriated the divine will of the Word, receiving from Him its every impulse and motion (*θεῖον ἐκέκτητο καὶ ἀδιάφορον θέλημα, ὑπ' αὐτοῦ* (Λόγου) *διὰ παντὸς ἀγομένη τε καὶ κινουμένη*), and never exercising its natural activity of its own initiative and independently of Him, but only when, how and inasmuch as the Word willed.

Nothing, then, could be expected from the Patriarch of Constantinople. In the year 648 or 649, Theodore deposed him;[42] but, at the same moment, or a short time before,

[38] Mansi, X, 702–705; *P. L.*, LXXXVII, 75–80.

[39] Cf. the acts in Mansi, X, 709–760; *P. G.*, CXI, 286–353. Cf. also Hefele, *Hist. of the Councils*, vol. V, p. 74–89.

[40] Cf. the letters in Mansi, X, 919, 926, 930, 943.

[41] Cf. his letter in Mansi, X, 1020; *P. L.*, LXXXVII, 91; Hahn, § 235.

[42] Mansi, X, 877 E.

in the year 648, the Emperor, at Paul's suggestion, published another edict,— the *Typus*.

The *Typus* [43] was intended to impose silence on both parties and to end the controversy by suppressing it. Monothelitism and Dyothelitism were dealt with on equal terms; all Christians were urged to abstain altogether from discussing whether there were in Christ one or two operations, one or two wills. The Ecthesis was withdrawn; but no one was to be molested on account of his former views, and severe punishments were enacted against offenders.

Had it been published some twenty years sooner, the *Typus* might have restored the peace; but now it was too late; the quarrel had become too bitter and called for an authoritative decision; silence was no longer possible. The discussion not only continued, but the debate took a wider range, and Rome prepared to strike a heavier blow.

Theodore, who died on May 14, 649, was succeeded, in the month of July, by Martin I, who had been apocrisiarius at Constantinople and knew the character of those with whom he had to deal. No sooner had he become pope than, spurred on by the abbot Maximus, he gathered at the Lateran, from October 5 till October 31, 649, a council of five hundred bishops, in which Monothelitism was closely examined, and which later on came to be regarded almost as a general council.[44] The Pope did not hesitate to come forward personally, and spoke a great deal. In the fifth session, the teaching of the Monothelite documents that had been read in the third, was compared with that of the Fathers and of heretics who had been already condemned.[45]

[43] See the text in Mansi, X, 1029–1032.

[44] There were five sessions. Acts in Mansi, X, 863.

[45] Three series of patristic texts were brought forward to prove (1) that, according to the Fathers, the operation and the will spring from the nature, and not from the hypostasis, and consequently that the

The outcome was a condemnation of the new error, couched in a profession of faith and twenty anathematisms.[46] The profession of faith was that of Chalcedon, with this addition: ". . . Et duas eiusdem [Christi] sicuti naturas inconfuse, ita et duas naturales voluntates, divinam et humanam, et duas naturales operationes, divinam et humanam, in approbatione perfecta et indiminuta eumdem veraciter esse perfectum Deum et hominem perfectum secundum veritatem, eumdem atque unum Dominum nostrum et Deum Iesum Chsritum, utpote volentem et operantem divine et humane nostram salutem." The same doctrine was reproduced in the anathematisms, the second of which asserted the spontaneity of Christ's suffering for us, and thus marked the importance of the controversy from the soteriological point of view. The eighteenth was directed against Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul of Constantinople, against the Ecthesis and the *Typus*.

§ 3. The Sixth General Council.

It was a bold step on the part of Martin I to condemn the *Typus*, especially as Rome was still under imperial rule. Constans II took his revenge. The Pope was seized by the exarch Theodore Calliopas, brought to Constantinople, and banished to Cherson, where he died, September 16, 655. Several bishops were molested; the abbot Maximus, after being mutilated and exiled several times for his attachment to Dyothelitism, expired August 13, 662. A new persecution had started.

Meanwhile, at Rome, Pope Eugene had replaced Pope

number of natures determines that of operations and wills; (2) that the Fathers ascribed to Christ two free-wills; and (3) that they ascribed to Him two natural operations.

[46] Mansi, X, 1150–1162; Hahn, § 181.

Martin on August 10, 654.[47] He tried to reach an agreement and sent apocrisiaries to Constantinople. They were so cleverly deceived that they accepted a hybrid teaching recognizing in Jesus Christ three wills — two natural wills and an hypostatic will.[48] This was again placing the principle of the Savior's human activity in the Word. On their return to Rome, the Pope's delegates were very coldly received. But Eugene died on June 2, 657, and under the rule of his successors, Vitalian (657–672), Adeodatus (672–676), and Donus (676–678), a sort of *modus vivendi,* based on mutual silence, was agreed upon with Constantinople, where the patriarchs were rapidly succeeding each other.

Once more, the Emperor's death put an end to the crisis. In the year 668, Constantine IV Pogonatus succeeded Constans II, who had been assassinated. He did not urge the acceptance of the *Typus,* and, as early as 678, asked Pope Agatho to send legates to Constantinople to examine peacefully and in good faith the question in dispute.

It was Agatho's will that his messengers should carry to Constantinople the decision of the Western Church, and for this purpose he had several councils held, some of the acts of which have been preserved.[49] He himself held a synod at Rome, about Easter, 680. It was attended by a hundred and twenty-five bishops. When his legates left, he gave them two letters, one, written in his own name to the Emperor and his two sons;[50] the other, written to the same, but in the name of the Pope and the bishops of his patriarchate.[51] It will suffice to analyze the former of these letters, since the latter adds nothing new to it. In this dogmatic letter, written after the fashion of St. Leo's

[47] Martin, who had been told of his election, had not protested.
[48] Mansi, XI, 12 and foll., 14; *P. G.,* XC, 133 and foll., 136.
[49] Mansi, XI, 175–177, 203–208.
[50] Mansi, XI, 234–286; *P. L.,* LXXXVII, 1161–1213; Hahn, § 236.
[51] Mansi, XI, 286–315; *P. L., ibid.,* 1216–1248.

Tomus, Agatho sets forth the faith of the Western Church. On the question of the wills and operations in Jesus Christ he says: "Cum duas autem naturas, duasque naturales voluntates, et duas naturales operationes confitemur in uno domino nostro Iesu Christo, non contrarias eas nec adversas ad alterutrum dicimus . . . nec tanquam separatas in duabus personis vel substantiis, sed duas dicimus, eumdemque dominum nostrum Iesum Christum sicut naturas ita et naturales in se voluntates et operationes habere, divinam scilicet et humanam." This, the Pope went on to say, is the faith of the apostolic church of St. Peter, which has never strayed from the truth, and whose authority has always been accepted by the universal Church. Then he explained more fully the doctrine of the two operations and the two wills, proved it from Scripture, quoted in its favor a series of texts from the Fathers, compared the Monothelite teaching with cognate errors and briefly outlined its history. In conclusion, he asked the Patriarch of Constantinople to accept the doctrine thus stated, and the Emperors to endeavor to bring about a peace based on such acceptance.

Provided with these papal letters, the legates arrived at Constantinople about September 10, 680. Pogonatus immediately convoked the bishops of the patriarchates of Constantinople and Antioch. He did not expect any representatives from the patriarchates of Jerusalem and Alexandria, which were then in the hands of the Mohammedans. He intended the meeting to be merely a conference for a quiet discussion of Monothelitism. But, contrary to expectations, the last-mentioned two patriarchates *were* represented. Thus the conference became a council, the 6th General Council.[52] It lasted from November 7, 680, to September 16, 681, and held eighteen sessions. The

[52] Cf. the acts in MANSI, XI.

official account of the first is signed by forty-eight names; that of the eighteenth, by a hundred and seventy-four. The papal legates' names are given and their signatures recorded, before the name and signature of George, patriarch of Constantinople. Besides, this was a council of critics and paleographers. The authenticity and integrity of the texts alleged were verified; MSS. were compared, sources carefully investigated. Librarians, archivists and copyists played an important part. These precautions did not prove entirely useless.

To give a detailed account of this Council is, of course, outside the scope of the present treatise; we shall note only the most significant facts. The leaders of the Monothelite opposition were the patriarch of Antioch, Macarius, his disciple, a monk named Stephen, and the two bishops of Nicomedia and Claneus, Peter and Solomon. The Patriarch of Constantinople, who was in sympathy with them, maintained an attitude of reserve. To bolster up their cause, the Monothelites had prepared patristic selections which were read in the 5th, 6th, 8th and 9th sessions; but, in the 3d and 14th, the Council, on the legates' protest and after an investigation, declared the two letters of Vigilius to Justinian and Theodora, which asserted that in Jesus Christ there was *una operatio,* and the letter of Mennas to Vigilius,[53] to be interpolated and surreptitiously introduced into the acts of the Council of 553. In the 7th and 10th sessions, the patristic selections that had been prepared by the legates in support of Dyothelitism were read, and in the 8th, George and his followers were invited to take a definite stand. George and the bishops of his patriarchate professed their acceptance of the legates' teaching, whereas Macarius continued to resist. He declared that he acknowl-

[53] Mansi, XI, 225, 584 and foll. Besides, the legates claimed that this last letter was unauthentic, πλαστός.

edged only ἓν θέλημα ὑποστατικὸν ἐπὶ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεανδρικὴν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνέργειαν,[54] that one will being also, according to his former declaration, that of the Father and the Holy Ghost.[55] All this was set forth at length in an ἔκθεσις or ὁμολογία πίστεως by the same Macarius, which was read to the Council.[56] For holding such views, Macarius and Stephen were deposed in the 9th session (March 8, 681). In the 13th session (March 28), the bishops condemned the dogmatic letters of Sergius to Cyrus of Phasis and to Honorius, and the first answer of Honorius, as "quite foreign to the apostolic dogmas, to the declarations of the holy councils, and all the holy Fathers, and as following the false teachings of the heretics." A few other writings, particularly the second letter of Honorius to Sergius, were also declared to be tainted with the same wickedness. Sergius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, Peter, Paul and Theodore of Pharan were anathematized, and likewise Honorius, "because we found in his letter to Sergius that in all respects he followed the view of the latter, and confirmed his impious doctrines." [57]

This was merely a prelude. The definitive sentence was promulgated in the 18th session, September 16, 681.[58] After reproducing the creeds of Nicæa and Constantinople, the Fathers of the Council accepted the letters of Agatho and his council to the Emperor, and repeated the creed of Chalcedon, with this addition: "We also declare that there are in Christ two natural θελήσεις or θελήματα, and two natural operations, without separation, conversion, division or mixture, according to the teaching of

[54] MANSI, XI, 349 C.
[55] MANSI, XI, 348 E.
[56] MANSI, XI, 349–360. The main paragraph is in col. 353 D; HAHN, § 237.
[57] MANSI, XI, 553–556.
[58] MANSI, XI, 624–697.

the holy Fathers. And the two natural wills are not opposed to each other,— God forbid,— as the impious heretics said, but His human will follows, and it does not resist and oppose, but rather is subject to the divine and almighty will. For the will of the human nature [of Jesus Christ] necessarily moved, but also subjected itself to the divine, as the most wise Athanasius says." [59] At the end, sentences of deposition and anathema are pronounced against all who are refractory, whether priests or laymen.

The address of the Council to the Emperor reasserted the same teaching and anathematized Theodore of Pharan, Sergius, Paul, Pyrrhus, Peter, Cyrus, "and with them Honorius, formerly bishop of Rome, as he followed them in their errors," and also Macarius, Stephen, and Polychronius.[60] Truth was victorious: Peter had spoken through Agatho. Besides, in a subsequent letter which the members of the Council forwarded to the Pope to ask him to approve what had been done, they proclaimed him the *πρωτοθρόνος τῆς οἰκουμενικῆς ἐκκλησίας*, who stands on the firm rock of the faith.[61]

The Emperor sanctioned all the decisions of the Council,[62] and Pope Leo II, who had succeeded Agatho on August 17, approved and confirmed them.[63] He also anathematized, together with the Greek Monothelites, "Honorius,

[59] *Καὶ δύο φυσικὰς θελήσεις ἤτοι θελήματα ἐν αὐτῷ (Χριστῷ), καὶ δύο φυσικὰς ἐνεργείας ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀμερίστως, ἀσυγχύτως κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων διδασκαλίαν ὡσαύτως κερύττομεν· καὶ δύο μὲν φυσικὰ θελήματα οὐχ ὑπεναντία, μὴ γένοιτο, καθὼς οἱ ἀσεβεῖς ἔφησαν αἱρετικοί, ἀλλ' ἑπόμενον τὸ ἀνθρώπινον αὐτοῦ θέλημα, καὶ μὴ ἀντιπίπτον, ἢ ἀντιπαλαῖον, μᾶλλον μὲν οὖν καὶ ὑποτασσόμενον τῷ θείῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ πανσθενεῖ θελήματι· ἔδει γὰρ τὸ τῆς σαρκὸς θέλημα κινηθῆναι, ὑποταγῆναι δὲ τῷ θελήματι τῷ θεϊκῷ κατὰ τὸν πάνσοφον Ἀθανάσιον* (Mansi, XI, 637; Hahn, § 149).

[60] Mansi, XI, 665.

[61] Mansi, XI, 684.

[62] *Ib.*, 697–712.

[63] *Ib.*, 726–735.

who neglected to sanctify this apostolic church with the teaching of apostolic tradition, but by profane treachery allowed its purity to be polluted." [64]

The condemnation pronounced by the 6th General Council was the deathblow of Monothelitism. The heresy revived from 711 to 713, through the exertions of the Emperor Philippicus, who had been a pupil of the monk Stephen; but only a short while. After it had been cut off from Monophysitism, in which it had its root, and deprived of the help of the secular power, Monothelitism could no longer maintain itself. It fell, and its fall brought the Christological controversies to a close in the East.[65] These controversies had lasted for about three centuries; and it was through a sort of successive and regular balancing that the Church upheld, against the radical views that had been proposed, both the personal unity and the integrity of Christ's human nature. Whilst the 5th General Council had confirmed the work of Ephesus, the 6th had resumed the principles of Chalcedon, and again proclaimed Jesus perfect in His manhood and endowed with a human will. Even merely verbal Monophysitism had not the last word, which proves that, contrary to what has been asserted, it was not the adequate and authentic expression of Greek piety.[66]

[64] Mansi, XI, 753 A. The Greek text reads *μιανθῆναι τὴν ἄσπιλον παρεχώρησε, immaculatam maculari permisit.* The reader will observe that the Greek is the primitive text, and must be preferred to that given by Mansi, 731 CD.

[65] Monophysitism reappeared now and then in the Iconoclast controversy, but only in the background, as it were, and confusedly.

[66] As is well known, Honorius' letters and his condemnation by the 6th General Council have given rise to heated controversies on the subject of papal infallibility and the right of a general council to judge the Pope. It belongs, of course, to dogmatic theology to solve these problems. However, I may be allowed to state that, to my mind, the difficulty has been exaggerated. Honorius' mistake was one of practical judgment, due to lack of perspicacity and reflection, rather

§ 4. The Christology of St. Maximus.[67]

The 6th General Council set its seal on the teaching of one who, among the Greeks (together with Sophronius of Jerusalem, though for a longer period), was the most illustrious defender of Dyothelitism,— St. Maximus Confessor.

Both as a mystical writer and as a theologian St. Maximus holds an important place in the religious history of the 7th century. As a mystical writer, he is related to Pseudo-Dionysius, on whose works he comments, and, through him, to the Neo-Platonic school, whose ideas he shares on the subject of the contemplation of the absolute as man's supreme end. As a theologian, he is concerned especially with Christ's person and assumes a very decided attitude in the Monothelite controversy. In these discussions, he freely borrows technical terms and definitions from Aristotle and is a precursor of the scholastics by the rigorous precision of his method.

We need not sum up the entire Christological teaching of St. Maximus; it reproduces exactly that of Leontius of Byzantium. We will dwell merely on what concerns Christ's activity and will.

According to Maximus, activity is essential to every being; we cannot conceive a being that exists and is not active. Such a being would be a mere nothing.[68] The activity of a being corresponds to its nature; it is by their acts and

than a doctrinal error strictly so called, and it is mainly from this viewpoint that his successors in the papal chair approved the sentence passed against him by the Council. Cf. J. CHAPMAN's very thorough and impartial essay, *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius,* London, 1907.

[67] His works (incompletely edited) in *P. G.,* XC, XCI and IV. We have also from him a *Computus ecclesiasticus* (*P. G.,* XIX, 1217–1280), and a *Chronologia succincta vitae Christi,* edit. BRATKE, in *Zeitschrift f. Kirchengeschichte,* XIII, 382–384. Studies: H. STRAUBINGER, *Die Christologie des hl. Maximus Confessor,* Bonn, 1906.

[68] *P. G.,* XCI, 200.

operations that beings are distinguished from one another, and that we know their nature.[69] Hence the operation or ἐνέργεια is, mainly, a property of the nature, belongs to it and is intrinsic to it, comes from it as from its immediate principle.[70] Personality may impart to an operation its moral value, but it is not its physical source.[71] Hence if we count two natures in Christ, we must also count two activities and operations. To say that these operations are subordinate, so that the human activity is a mere instrument in the hands of the Word, does not solve the difficulty: for we fall into Apollinarianism if we make the humanity an instrument natural to the Word; or we are thrown back into Nestorianism if we make it an instrument external to Him.[72] As to the arguments drawn from the testimonies of St. Cyril and Dionysius the Areopagite, it is easy to answer them. When the former spoke of a μία τε καὶ συγγενὴς ἐνέργεια, resulting in Christ both from the Word and from the flesh, he had in mind especially the miracles wrought by Jesus through the power of the Word, but with the concourse of His humanity, as, for instance, when He laid His hand on the sick man. In this case, there was morally only one action, producing one effect, even though a share of it was attributable to each of the natures.[73] Moreover, when speaking of a καινή τις θεανδρικὴ ἐνέργεια, Dionysius meant to mark the close harmony with which the two natures acted together in virtue of their circumincession (περιχώρησις), or even, like Cyril, to desig-

[69] *Ibid.*

[70] *P. G.*, XC, 152; XCI, 333–341.

[71] Maximus grounds this assertion on a Trinitarian proof. If we refer the operations and the will to the person, we must admit in the Trinity three operations and wills, which is absolutely opposed to the teaching of the Fathers (*P. G.*, XC, 152; XCI, 289, 292).

[72] *P. G.*, XCI, 64.

[73] *P. G.*, XCI, 85, 101, 344, 345.

nate those complex operations in which the Word and the man exercised their activity at the same time.[74]

Maximus proceeds in a similar way when he takes up the question of the two wills. Every being possesses a *θέλημα φυσικόν*, at least a blind appetite for the good that befits it.[75] That appetite is necessary and irresistible. But in man, in whom the mind intervenes, the particular object of that appetite, desire and will, is determined by rational considerations. The choice (*προαίρεσις*) is directed by previous reflections (*βουλή, βούλευσις*). The determination which is then taken, the act of the will which is formed in view of these considerations, is called *θέλημα γνωμικόν*.[76] Hence the *θέλημα γνωμικόν* implies, on the part of the subject who wills, an examination, a sort of previous hesitation, caused by the subject's lack of an immediate and complete view of the character of the object towards which he tends. The *θέλημα γνωμικόν*, then, is not distinct from the *θέλημα φυσικόν*, as the particular from the general, nor as the free from the necessary; for the *θέλημα φυσικόν* can also be free, with a higher freedom even, which excludes the possibility of erring and sinning. God wills freely in that sense.[77] The *θέλημα γνωμικόν* is the merely human will, always fallible and imperfect in some way.

After laying down these principles, Maximus remarks that, since free-will is a part of human nature, and the Word has really assumed that nature, He has also really assumed free-will,[78] but without its defects, *i.e.*, the possibility to err

[74] *P. G.*, IV, 530 and foll.; XCI, 100, 345, 1045 and foll.

[75] *Θέλημά φασιν εἶναι φυσικὸν, ἤγουν θέλησιν, δύναμιν τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν ὄντος ὀρεκτικήν* (*P. G.*, XCI, 12, 192).

[76] *P. G.*, XCI, 21 and foll., 153, 308.

[77] *P. G.*, IV, 141; XC, 1088. We may notice that Maximus shares the Platonic view, according to which ignorance is the source of sin. *P. G.*, 989 A.

[78] *P. G.*, XCI, 73 and foll., 301 and foll.

and sin, which springs from ignorance and concupiscence, to neither of which Christ is subject. There is then in Him the *θέλημα φυσικόν, i.e.,* the will and act of willing, such as befit our nature, but not the *θέλημα γνωμικόν,* which is caused by imperfections in that nature. To take a decision, Jesus Christ did not need to weigh the *pro* and *con,* nor appeal to exterior motives; the good appeared to Him at once, and His will was inclined to it without any obstacle whatever.[79]

It was the hypostatic union which was the principle of that perfect rectitude of Christ's human will. We cannot think, in the God-man, of any moral deviation attributable to the Word. This is why, contrary to the affirmation of the Monothelites, we must admit in Jesus Christ two wills, one divine, the other human, nor fear lest they should oppose and fight each other. There is but *one* who wills, the Word Incarnate, who cannot perform two contrary volitions; and it is impossible that the human will, which is deified like the whole humanity of Jesus Christ, should not agree with His divine will. It *does* agree with the divine will, though freely, and by a human and spontaneous volition.[80]

These are the main outlines of the theory developed by St. Maximus, in support of which he quoted several biblical passages and the testimonies of ancient ecclesiastical writers. Like Pope Martin and the Council of 649, he compiled in favor of Dyothelitism a collection of patristic texts,[81] though his erudition is less extensive and critical than theirs. It was mainly from its philosophical aspect that the question appealed to him, and it is from this viewpoint also that we are concerned with his work. He realized fully the attractiveness of Monothelitism and how easily it explained the unity of Christ's life. Hence he did not reject it in an offhand

[79] *Ib.,* 308 and foll.
[80] *P. G.,* XCI, 30, 48.
[81] *P. G.,* XCI, 160–169.

way, but rather endeavored to substitute for the all too simple and, as it were, mechanical explanation of that unity, proposed by these heretics, another based on the moral harmony that necessarily results in the God-man from the oneness of His person and the sanctification of His humanity.

CHAPTER VII

GREEK THEOLOGY FROM THE FIFTH TO THE SEVENTH CENTURY, ON OTHER SUBJECTS THAN CHRISTOLOGY

§ 1. God and the Trinity.

God transcends every thought (*ὑπὲρ πάντα νοῦν*);[1] yet, we have some innate knowledge of Him (*ἔμφυτος θεογνωσία*),[2] and, as He is the author of creatures, we can know, through them, not only that He is, but also, in some way (*ἀναλόγως*) what He is:[3] these three ideas sum up St. Cyril's teaching concerning our rational knowledge of God. That teaching hardly differs from that of St. Athanasius and reproduces, on the whole, the previous tradition. The Pseudo-Areopagite developed it considerably.

This theologian lays down, as a principle, God's absolute transcendence, as it was conceived by Neo-Platonism. God does not belong to any genus or category; He is *ὑπὲρ λόγον καὶ νοῦν καὶ οὐσίαν*: *formally* He possesses none of the attributes of wisdom, goodness, beauty and intelligence that we admire in the world; no name, taken from creatures, can befit Him, properly speaking: He is *ἀνώνυμος*.[4]

Yet, God is the author of whatever is positive and good in this world. He is, then, in a certain way, all that positive and good, which is merely the multiplied expression

[1] Cyril, *In psalm.* XI, vers. 3 (*P. G.*, LXIX, 793); cf. *In psalm.* XXXIII, vers. 6 (col. 885).

[2] *Id., Glaphyr. in Genesim,* I (col. 36).

[3] *Id., In Isaiam,* IV, orat. 1 (*P. G.*, LXX, 873).

[4] *De divin. nominibus,* I, 1, 5, 6 (col. 588, 593, 596); *De mystica theologia,* V (col. 1045).

of His absolute unity; and, from this point of view, He is also πολυώνυμος.[5]

We can, therefore, affirm something of God, but we must observe, at the same time, that, whilst being all this, He is all this excellently, or rather He is above all this; for, to speak properly, He is not what we may see and conceive, since all our ideas and concepts are derived from creatures.

Hence there are, in the genesis of our idea of God, three intellectual acts that can be distinguished by analysis. A first act, by which we ascribe to God all the qualities of the beings whose principle He is: this is the *affirmative theology*.— A second act, by which we deny Him these same qualities, because He transcends them (ὡς ὑπὲρ πάντα ὑπερούσῃ): this is the *negative theology*.— Lastly, a third act, by which we notice that our negation does not destroy our first affirmation, for it declares merely that God is above all that we can affirm or deny of Him, ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν καὶ ἀφαίρεσιν καὶ θέσιν.[6] This process is what the scholastics later on called *via eminentiae*. Dionysius exemplified it by multiplying words composed with αὐτό, ἀρχή, ὑπέρ on the one hand, and privative ἀ, on the other, and applying them to God. The former mark God as the being, the essential perfection, and the principle of every being and perfection; the latter denote that — formally — He is no definite perfection, but above every perfection and being.

However, this progressive knowledge is not the only knowledge of God that we can obtain here below. Side by side with it, or rather in continuation of it, there is the direct vision, the state in which, all reasoning being suspended, in the absolute silence of human nature, and amid the complete suspense of all its faculties, the soul in a sort of mystic nirvanâ, without formal ideas, enters into im-

[5] *De divin. nomin.*, I, 6; II, 3, 11 (col. 596, 640, 649).
[6] *De mystica theol.*, I, 2 (col. 1000); *Epist.* I (col. 1065).

mediate contact with the Supreme Being.[7] This is the Neo-Platonic ecstasy.

This teaching of the Pseudo-Areopagite has naturally passed into the works of his commentator, St. Maximus, who also emphasizes very strongly the divine transcendence, and sets forth the theory of the two theologies — affirmative and negative — which pave the way for the concept of God.[8]

The formulas of the Trinitarian consubstantiality had been settled once for all by the Cappadocians. However, it was but natural that the discussions raised by the Monothelite controversy, regarding the meaning of the terms φύσις and ὑπόστασις, should have their echo in the domain of the Trinity and give rise to some confusion. If φύσις and ὑπόστασις were to be identified in Christology, why not also when speaking of the Trinity? The Cappadocian distinction μία φύσις, τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις, was, then, without foundation, and since three hypostases were proclaimed in God, three natures, three substances must also be proclaimed in Him. This was the conclusion drawn, at Constantinople, about the middle of the 6th century, by a comparatively unknown philosopher, John Askunages, and propounded publicly, about the same time, by the Alexandrian scholar, John Philoponus. The latter was a distinguished Aristotelian, the author of a work entitled *The Arbiter* (Διαιτητής), of which important fragments have been preserved by St. John Damascene.[9] Philoponus remarks that

[7] *De myst. theol.*, II, III (col. 1025, 1033).

[8] *Capitum theol. et oeconomic.*, centuria I, 4, 7; centur. II, 2, 3; *Mystagogia*, Prooemium (*P. G.*, XCI, 664). Compare the definition of God, given by Anastasius Sinaita: θεὸς μέν ἐστιν οὐσία ἀναίτιος, αἰτία παναλκὴς, πάσης αἰτίας αἰτία τις ὑπερούσιος. Θεός ἐστιν ἀνώνυμος καὶ ἀσήμαντος παρ' ἀνθρώποις ὕπαρξις, πάσης ὑπάρξεως ποιητική (*Hodegos*, II, *P. G.*, LXXXIX, 53).

[9] *De haeresibus*, 83 (*P. G.*, XCIV and foll.). The whole work exists in a Syriac translation, kept in the British Museum (Wright, *Catalog.*,

every existing nature is necessarily individual, and that, being individual, it is necessarily an hypostasis, since individual and hypostasis are identical.[10] He concludes that, since there is in Jesus Christ only one hypostasis, there is in Him only one nature, and also that, since there are in God three hypostases, we must also count in Him three natures: Ἔστω τρεῖς φύσεις λέγειν ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος.[11] The name Tritheists (τριθεῖται), which was given to his disciples, does not mean that they really believed in three gods. In his *De receptione haereticorum,*[12] the priest Timothy expressly remarks that, although they hold three equal substances (οὐσίας) or natures (φύσεις), they are unwilling to assert that there are three gods or divinities.

Another error, which proceeded from excessive realism, was set forth by the Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria, Damian (578–605).[13] The Father, he said, is one individual, the Son, another individual, and the Holy Ghost, another individual; but each one of these three persons is not God by nature and in Himself (καθ' ἑαυτὸν θεὸν φύσει), but only through a participation of the divine nature existing inseparably in each. Each is an hypostasis; what is common to them is θεός, οὐσία καὶ φύσις. This teaching would lead one to hold either a quaternity, if one were to add to the three Persons God considered in Himself, or a sort of Sabellianism, if one were to look upon them as mere forms in which God manifested Himself. In fact, Damian's followers were charged at times with Sabellianism, at other

II, 587; cf. I, 114, 388). About John Philoponus cf. also *De sectis,* Actio V, 6; Photius, *Biblioth.,* codd. 21, 24, 75; John of Ephesus, *Hist. eccles.,* V, 1–12. Cf. O. Bardenhewer, *Patrologie,* 3d edit., p. 471 (English transl., p. 544).

[10] Ἄτομον δὲ ταυτὸν εἶναι καὶ ὑπόστασιν ἀρτίως δεδείχαμεν (col. 753).

[11] *De sectis, Actio* V, c. 6 (*P. G.,* LXXXVI, 1, col. 1233).

[12] *P. G.,* LXXXVI, 1, col. 61.

[13] Timothy, *De receptione haereticorum,* col. 60.

times with Tetradism. They are known in history as τετραδῖται.

These speculations, which originated comparatively late, attracted the attention of the writers of the latter part of the period now under review, particularly St. John Damascene, who refuted them; but they did not influence the traditional Trinitarian teaching, formulated by the Fathers of the 4th century. During the 5th century, that teaching hardly made any progress. St. Cyril and Theodoret, who both wrote on the subject of the Trinity, added nothing to it — except what we shall find later in connection with the Holy Ghost. We merely note the apparition of the expression τρόποι ὑπάρξεως, modes of existence,[14] to designate the divine persons, which occurs in certain fragments wrongly attributed to Amphilochius,[15] and which were used afterwards;[16] and the more frequent use of πρόσωπον instead of ὑπόστασις to designate the divine persons. But, both in the Pseudo-Areopagite and St. Maximus, the distinction between the Persons of the Trinity tends naturally to decrease in behalf of the divine unity, and their concept of the Trinity is quite similar to the Occidental one, especially as held by St. Augustine. True to his dialectical method, Dionysius boldly declares that the words *unity* and *trinity* do not really express what God's transcendent being is:[17] both insist on the circumincession of the three divine Persons as a consequence of the fundamental unity of their substance.[18]

[14] The word is found already in St. Basil, *Homilia contra sabellianos et Arium et anomoeos*, *P. G.*, XXXI, 613, in the sense of the Holy Ghost's manner of existing: περὶ τοῦ τρόπου τῆς ὑπάρξεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Later on it designated a subsisting relation.

[15] *P. G.*, XXXIX, col. 112.

[16] St. Maximus, *Exposit. orat. dominicae* (*P. G.*, XC, 893).

[17] *De divin. nomin.*, XIII, 3, col. 981.

[18] *Ibid.*, and II, 4 (col. 641). St. Maximus, *Capit. theolog. et oeconom.*, cent. II, 1; *Exposit. orat. dom.* (col. 892, 893). St. Maximus

The question of the procession of the Holy Ghost deserves special attention. As the reader will recall, the Greek Church of the 4th century had finally selected the formula ἐκ πατρὸς δι' υἱοῦ, which, strictly speaking, could be taken to signify that the Son is, as it were, a medium that is gone through by the Father in producing the Holy Ghost, but which St. Epiphanius in particular seems to have understood of the Son's real and active, though subordinate, participation in the production of that same Spirit. The first meaning seems to have been accepted by the school of Antioch, especially by Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret. In the symbol quoted and condemned by the Council of Ephesus and which is generally looked upon as the work of Theodore,[19] this last writer, though he admits that the Holy Spirit is from the Father, denies that He is the Son and has received His existence through the Son: καὶ οὔτε υἱὸν νομίζομεν, οὔτε διὰ υἱοῦ τὴν ὕπαρξιν εἰληφός. On the other hand, the same writer replied to St. Cyril, who had written[20] that the Holy Spirit is not a power foreign to Jesus Christ, but a power that belongs to Him properly, inasmuch as it is His own Spirit (ἴδιον αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα), through which He wrought miracles,— that, if by the expression ἴδιον τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ, Cyril meant to say that the Holy Ghost is consubstantial with the Son and proceeds from the Father, this was a pious assertion that could be accepted; but that, if he meant to say that the Holy Ghost draws His existence from the Son, or through the Son, this was an ungodly blasphemy that must be rejected: εἰ δ' ὡς ἐξ υἱοῦ ἢ δι' υἱοῦ τὴν ὕπαρξιν ἔχον (τὸ πνεῦμα), ὡς βλάσφημον τοῦτο καὶ ὡς δυσσεβὲς ἀπορρίψομεν.[21]

defines the Trinity: Μονὰς οὐσίας τρισυπόστατος καὶ τριὰς ὑποστάσεων ὁμοούσιος (*Mystagogia*, XXIII, *P. G.*, XCI, 700).

[19] Mansi, IV, 1347; *P. G.*, LXVI, 1016; Hahn, § 215.

[20] In his IXth anathematism, Mansi, IV, 1084; *P. G.*, LXXVI, 308.

[21] Mansi, V, 124; *P. G.*, LXXVI, 432.

Like his master, then, Theodoret denied to the Son any active part in the production of the Holy Ghost.[22]

Cyril's teaching is altogether different. True, he never uses the definitive formula ἐκπορεύεται ἐξ υἱοῦ; he shrinks from identifying ἐκπορεύεται with λαμβάνει; he fails apparently to realize the question of the procession *ex Filio;* he seems even to avoid it when it presents itself naturally;[23] but his teaching goes manifestly in the direction of the Latin formula: whilst it does not expressly contain the wording itself of that formula, it implies its substance.[24] Thus, the Holy Spirit is not only the Son's own Spirit (ἴδιον),[25] the Spirit of the Son as well as of the Father,[26] the Spirit that is from the Son and in Him, and His own Spirit (ἐξ αὐτοῦ τε καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἴδιον αὐτοῦ),[27] that Spirit is also the Spirit of the Son, and in Him and from Him, just as the Son is begotten ἐκ θεοῦ κατὰ φύσιν: the relation of the Spirit to the Son is that

[22] We believe it was in this causative sense that, like Theodore, Theodoret denied that the Holy Ghost was δι' υἱοῦ, for the expression itself was so commonly used that they could scarce have condemned it. On the other hand, we can hardly think that Theodoret also condemns the view that would make the Holy Ghost a creature of the Son (τὴν ὕπαρξιν ἔχον), for in the *Eranistes,* III (col. 264), he employs that same expression to signify that the Holy Ghost has His being from the Father: ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦτο (τὸ πνεῦμα) ἔχει τὴν ὕπαρξιν. Moreover, Theodoret confesses that the Holy Ghost is the spirit of Christ and of the Father (*In epist. ad Roman.,* VIII, 11, col. 132).

[23] For instance, *De ss. Trinitate,* dialog. VII (col. 1080, 1092, 1104, 1117, 1120, 1121).

[24] The demonstration of this point, already made by Petau (*De trinit.,* lib. VII, cap. 3 and foll.) has been fully developed by J. Desseigne in an unpublished thesis, presented in 1901 to the faculty of theology of Lyons.

[25] *Adv. Nestorium,* IV, 3 (col. 184); *De ss. Trinitate,* dial. VII (col. 1013), etc.

[26] *In Ioannem,* I, 33 (col. 208); *De recta fide ad reg.,* II, 34 (col. 1380).

[27] *De ss. Trinit.,* dial. VII (col. 1120, cf. 1093); cf. *Adv. Nestor.,* IV, 1 (col. 173).

of the Son to the Father;[28] the Son owns as His own property the Holy Ghost, who is from Him and substantially in Him (*ἴδιον ἔχων τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐσιωδῶς ἐμπεφυκὸς αὐτῷ πνεῦμα ἅγιον*).[29] Carefully distinguishing the mission *ad extra* from the production *ad intra,* Cyril observes that the Holy Spirit is in the Son and from (ἐξ) the Son *φυσικῶς, κατὰ φύσιν*;[30] that from the Son He receives His power, science, and action, because from the Son He comes *θεοπρεπῶς, ὡς ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ φυσικῶς προϊόν*;[31] that He proceeds from the Son's ineffable nature, *ὡς δι' αὐτῆς προϊὸν τῆς ἀπορρήτου φύσεως αὐτοῦ*.[32] Thus, the Holy Ghost is of the substance of the Father and the Son, *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ,* He is essentially from the Father and the Son, from the Father through the Son, *τὸ οὐσιωδῶς ἐξ ἀμφοῖν, ἤγουν ἐκ πατρὸς δι' υἱοῦ προχεόμενον πνεῦμα,* because of the identity of their substance; for, as the Holy Ghost comes essentially from the divine substance (*οὐσιωδῶς ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς προϊόν*), and as that substance is common to the Father and the Son, the Holy Spirit is proper to both and is from the Father through the Son (*καὶ ἀμφοῖν ὡς ἓν ἐκ πατρὸς δι' υἱοῦ διὰ τὴν ταυτότητα τῆς οὐσίας*).[33]

St. Cyril uses comparisons that represent the Holy Ghost as a sort of emanation from the Son. The comparison of the flower and its perfume is worthy of notice:

"Jesus Christ does not say that the Holy Ghost will become wise through a sort of [exterior] participation coming from Him, nor transmit to the saints the Son's discourses in the

[28] *In Ioelem,* XXXV (col. 377).
[29] *Explic. duodecim capitum,* IX (col. 308).
[30] *Thesaurus,* XXXIV (col. 576, 600, 608); *Adv. Nestor.,* IV, 3 (col. 184).
[31] *In Ioannem,* XI, 1 (col. 449); *Thesaurus,* XXXIV (col. 584).
[32] *Adv. Nestor.,* IV, 3 (col. 181, 184).
[33] *De adoratione in spir. et verit.,* I (col. 148); *Thesaurus,* XXXIV (col. 584, 585); *De ss. Trinit.,* dialog. VI (col. 1009, 1013).

fashion of a servant. But it is as though a flower of the most exquisite scent said of the perfume, which emanates from it and with which it fills the senses of all bystanders. *It shall receive from me.* [Of course] that flower would thus designate a natural property, and not something that would be separate and accruing [from the outside]. It is thus we must understand [the relations] of the Son and the Holy Ghost. For as He is the Spirit of wisdom and strength, He is all wisdom and all strength, preserving in Himself the operation of Him by whom He is sent, and manifesting in His own nature that of Him from whom He comes" (*ὅλην ἐξ ὅλου τὴν τοῦ προϊέντος ἐνέργειαν ἀποσῶζον ἐν ἑαυτῷ, καὶ ὡς ἐν ἰδίᾳ φύσει καταδεικνύον εὖ μάλα τὴν οὔπτές ἐστιν*).[34]

Elsewhere the Son is compared to honey, and the Holy Spirit to its sweetness;[35] the Son to light, and the Holy Spirit to its ray;[36] the Son to fire, and the Holy Spirit to heat; the Son to water, and the Holy Spirit to the coolness it produces.[37]

That St. Cyril tended to affirm the procession of the Holy Ghost *ex Filio* is, then, unquestionable; but the subsequent Greek theologians followed him only imperfectly. In his *History of the Council of Nicæa* (about 475), II, 20, 22, Gelasius of Cyzicus merely affirms that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and is special to the Son (*ἴδιον*).[38] The same reserve is noticeable in the Pseudo-Areopagite[39] and in the author of the *De sectis,* I, i.[40] We thus come down to the 7th century, and all that time the Greeks do not seem to have noticed the progress that had taken place

[34] *De ss. Trinit.,* dial. VI (col. 1012; cf. 1020).
[35] *Thesaurus,* XXXIV, col. 588.
[36] *Ibid.,* col. 589.
[37] *Ibid.,* col. 593.
[38] *P. G.,* LXXXV, 1288, 1296.
[39] *De divin. nomin.,* II, 7.
[40] *P. G.,* LXXXVI, 1, col. 1196.

in the Latin doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost since St. Augustine. No sooner do the Monothelites realize it than they denounce the procession of the Holy Ghost *ex Filio* as erroneous. Pope Martin I had probably laid down that teaching somewhere in the written documents he sent to the East in connection with Monothelitism. His opponents accused him of heterodoxy. St. Maximus, from whom we learn these facts,[40a] strives to exonerate the Pope by explaining that, when they say that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son, the Latins do not intend to represent the Son as the cause (*αἰτία*) of the Holy Ghost, for the Father alone is, properly speaking, the cause of the other two Persons, but merely to point out that the Holy Ghost comes through the Son (*ἀλλ' ἵνα τὸ δι' αὐτοῦ προϊέναι δηλώσωσι*), and that both have the same substance. This was to reduce the Latin formula to the meaning of the Greek formula. At all events, St. Maximus personally contents himself with the latter formula: the Holy Ghost, he says, "proceeds substantially and ineffably from the Father through the begotten Son," *ἐκ τοῦ πατρός οὐσιωδῶς δι' υἱοῦ γεννηθέντος ἀφράστως ἐκπορευόμενον.*[41]

§ 2. Angelology.

As we have seen, the Cappadocians did not hold definite views on the subject of the spirituality, strictly so called, of the angels. St. Gregory of Nazianzus hesitated to speak positively on the subject. During the 5th century, Church writers still teach that angels are *ἀσώματοι*,[42] *ὑπὲρ σῶμα καὶ*

[40a] *P. G.*, XCI, 133, 136; cf. *P. L.*, CXXIX, 577.

[41] *Quaestiones ad Thalassium*, LXIII (*P. G.*, XC, 672); *Quaest. et dubia*, Interrog. 34.

[42] Theodoret, *Quaest. in Genes.*, Interrog. 3 (col. 81) and cf. interr. 69 (col. 177); *Quaest. in Exod.*, Interr. 29 (col. 257); *Graec. affect. curatio*, III (col. 891).

αἴσθησιν,[43] φύσις ἄσαρκος ἀόρατος, and that they cannot experience concupiscence.[44] These authors protest especially against the ancient interpretation of *Genesis* VI, 2, according to which the "sons of God" seduced by women were angels.[45] However, it would be rash to infer that the doctrine of the spirituality of the angels was commonly held in the East at that early date. The meaning of the word σῶμα was not as definite for these writers as it is for us. St. Cyril of Jerusalem observes that whatever has not a gross body (παχὺ σῶμα) can rightly be called spirit (πνεῦμα).[46] Philoponus charges Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret with ascribing subtle bodies to angels.[47] On the other hand, Anastasius Sinaita distinguishes between earthly bodies that have three dimensions, heavenly bodies that have neither depth nor thickness (πάχος), and material bodies (ὑλικόν) that can be touched and are corruptible, and lastly simple bodies (λεπτόν) that do not fall under the sense of touch.[48]

About the end of the 5th century the Pseudo-Areopagite plainly asserts the spirituality of angels. He speaks of their deiform simplicity, θεοιδεστάτη ἁπλότης, and their altogether intelligent life, and calls them supramundane spirits (ὑπερκοσμίων νοῶν).[49] This concept was destined to prevail in the long run. St. Maximus incorporated it in his scholia; but it was mainly in the Latin Church that it was fully developed. Anastasius Sinaita merely points out τὸ ἀπαθὲς τῆς

[43] Cyril, *Contra Iulian.*, III (col. 641); *Glaphyr. in Genes.*, II (col. 52, 53).

[44] Basil of Seleucia, *Orat.* VI (col. 88); Isidor. Pelus., *Epist.* IV, 192.

[45] Cyril, *Glaph. in Genes.*, II (col. 54); Theodoret, *Quaest. in Genes.*, Interr. 47 (col. 148); Basil of Seleuc., *Orat.* VI (col. 88); Isid. Pelus., *Epist.* IV, 192.

[46] *Catecheses*, XVI, 15.

[47] *De opificio mundi*, I, 16, edit. G. Reichardt, Leipzig, 1897.

[48] *Hodegos*, II, col. 73.

[49] *De caelesti hierarchia*, IV, 1, 2; XV, 1.

οὐσίας, as something special to the angelic nature, and adds: ἀπαθὲς δὲ τὸ ἀθάνατον αὐτῷ εἶπον.[50]

Theodoret deems it probable that the creation of the angels did not precede but accompanied that of heaven and earth.[51] As to the sin of the fallen angels, those theologians who refused to look upon it as a sin of the flesh, could but see in it a sin of pride. This is the view of St. Cyril,[52] Theodoret,[53] and Basil of Seleucia.[54]

This was no new teaching. The chief novelty introduced into angelology at that time was the Pseudo-Areopagite's division of the angels into three hierarchies and nine orders. Up to his time, Church writers, relying on the data of the Old Testament and St. Paul, held no definite views as to the number or categories of angels; they regarded these speculations as of but little importance. Theodoret, for instance, mentions the principalities, powers, thrones, dominations, seraphim, cherubim, "and others unknown to us."[55] Dionysius accepts the appellations used before him, but his division rests on a theory of mystical philosophy that influences his whole theology. The end of divine action is to deify us (θείωσις), and this deification comprises three successive operations, *viz.*, purification, illumination and perfection (κάθαρσις, φωτισμός, τελείωσις).[56] Now that action of God upon us is not produced directly; it requires intermediaries, and the angels are such intermediaries. The brightest among them, who make up the first hierarchy, communicate with God directly and draw their light from Him. The

[50] *Hodegos,* II, col. 64.
[51] *Quaest. in Genes.,* Interr. 4 (col. 84).
[52] *In Ioannem,* V (col. 809).
[53] *Graecar. affect. curatio* (III, col. 896).
[54] *Orat.* XXIII (col. 269).
[55] *In psalm.* CIII, vers. 21 (col. 1692); cf. Basil. Seleuc., *Orat.* XXXIX (col. 429).
[56] *De caelesti hierarchia,* III, 1, 2.

lowest, who constitute the third hierarchy, are closer to the earth, and communicate with us. They receive their light from the first hierarchy, but only indirectly, for, between the first and the third hierarchy, there is a second, enlightened by the first and transmitting light to the third, and thus fulfilling between them that function which the angels, as a body, fulfil between God and us. Besides, the number of intermediaries is still greater: for every hierarchy is composed of two extremes and one middle, *i.e.,* of three orders of angels, whose mutual relations are precisely those of the various hierarchies between themselves. Thus, we obtain nine orders of heavenly spirits, which Dionysius classifies as follows: The first hierarchy includes the thrones, cherubim, and seraphim; the second, the powers, dominations, and virtues; the third, the angels, archangels, and principalities.[57]

Although Dionysius dwells at length upon the relations of the angels with men, he does not mention their function as guardian angels. However, the belief that ascribes not only to kingdoms and churches, but also to every man, or at least to every one of the faithful, an angel with a special mission to direct them, was always held in honor. St. Cyril knows that belief and adopts it in many passages.[58] Theodoret does likewise and observes that every nation has an archangel for its guardian.[59]. Anastasius Sinaita assigns an angel to every one of the faithful (πιστός).[60] Whilst these authors do not describe the functions of the guardian angels, we may reasonably surmise them from what they tell us elsewhere when speaking of the func-

[57] *De caelesti hierarchia,* IV, 3; VI, 2; VII, 2; VIII, 2; IX, 2; X, 1.
[58] *Glaph. in Genes.,* IV (col. 189); *In psalm.* XXXIII, v. 8 (col. 888); XLIX, v. 4 (col. 1078); *Contra Iulian.,* IV (col. 688).
[59] *Quaest. in Genes.,* Interr. 3 (col. 81); *In Daniel.,* X, 13 (col. 1496, 1497).
[60] *Quaest.* LVII (col. 621).

tions of the good angels in general. Angels enlighten us and teach us truths; they prompt us to pray and intercede for us; they bring the elect into heaven; but they cannot forgive sins nor by themselves sanctify our souls.[61]

§ 3. Man. The Fall. Grace.

St. Cyril defines man as *ζῶον λογικὸν, θνητὸν, νοῦ καὶ ἐπιστήμης δεκτικόν.*[62] In man, created free, there are two substances,[63] body and soul. The soul is defined by St. Maximus as [*Οὐσία*] *ἀσώματος, ἁπλῆ, ἀθάνατος, λογική*;[64] and by Anastasius Sinaita: *Οὐσία λεπτὴ, ἄϋλος καὶ ἀσχημάτιστος, εἰκὼν θεοῦ καὶ τύπος.*[65] It is generally held that every soul is created,[66] and St. Maximus in particular teaches that the soul exists neither before nor after the body: the two constitutive elements of man are produced simultaneously.[67]

These are mere philosophical teachings. What concerns us far more, is to know how far the Pelagian controversy had found an echo in the Greek world, and to what extent the theology of original sin had progressed under that influence. As the reader may recall, Theodore of Mopsuestia had first showed some favor to the Pelagian views, and then, under the pressure of circumstances, had changed his attitude.[68] On the other hand, the Council of Ephesus confirmed, in its letter to Pope Celestine, the condemnation

[61] Cyril, *In psalm.* XLI, v. 5 (col. 1004); *In Ioannem,* I (col. 128); *Thesaurus,* assertio XIII (col. 252), XX (col. 345); St. Nilus, *De oratione,* 81; *Epist.* IV, 13; *Sententiae,* 16.

[62] *In Ioannem,* VI (col. 932).

[63] Theodoret, *Haeretic. fabul. comp.,* V, 11 (col. 492); St. Maximus, *Capitum quinquies centenorum,* centuria II, 32.

[64] *De anima* (col. 356 and foll.); cf. *Epist.* VI, 3 (col. 425).

[65] *Hodegos,* II (col. 72).

[66] Cyril, *Adv. Nestor.,* I, 4 (col. 37); Theodoret, *Quaest. in Genes.,* Interrog. 23 (col. 121), 39 (col. 137).

[67] *Epist.* XII (col. 489).

[68] Marius Mercator, *Monumenta . . . Excerpta ex libris Theod. Mopsuest.,* praef., 3 (*P. L.,* XLVIII).

pronounced by Zosimus against the Pelagians.[69] These two facts show that, since the Council of Diospolis, the Orientals had paid some attention to this question. However, we shall see presently that, on the whole, they were far from sharing St. Augustine's views.

On the original elevation of our first parents to a superior state all indeed agreed. St. Cyril implies, and even says explicitly, that Adam had been created for immortality, with a propensity to what is right, free from inordinate concupiscence and enjoying God's familiarity; that he was enriched with natural blessings and, besides, had received the Holy Ghost, the gift of prophecy, infused wisdom and knowledge. However, his body was from the earth, and therefore, was naturally subject to death; but through a special privilege, it would not die, for it had been raised above its native condition.[70] Maximus speaks of the knowledge and immortality imparted to Adam.[71] Theodoret also, who, as a rule, is more reticent, observes that God had raised the first man to a better condition than that of this earth, *i.e.*, to immortality, and even though he strives to explain naturally the absence of concupiscence between Adam and Eve, he must confess that it was absent.[72]

Unfortunately man did not preserve the prerogatives of his primitive condition. With Christ's reparation in view, God allowed Adam to sin.[73] By the fall, he became mortal, subject to corruption, concupiscence, and ignorance, and prone to evil; he was deprived of the divine gifts and the

[69] *Epist.* XX, 3, 6 (*P. L.*, L, 518, 522).

[70] *In psalm.* VI, v. 3 (col. 745); LXXVIII, v. 8 (col. 1197); *In Ioelem*, XXXV (col. 377); *In Ioannem*, I (col. 128); V (col. 752); *Cont. Iulian.*, III (col. 637, 640).

[71] *Capit. quinq. centen.*, cent. II, 26; *Quaest. ad Thalass.*, qu. XXI (col. 312).

[72] *Quaest. in Genes.*, Interrog. 28 (col. 125), 37 (col. 137); *In psalm.* L, v. 7 (col. 1244).

[73] Cyril, *Glaph. in Genes.*, I (col. 25).

Holy Ghost. This constitutes the original fall. Adam did not fall alone; with him and through him fell all his offspring. In the Augustinian and Latin theory of original sin, that fall comprises two degrees, or, in other words, two distinct falls. The children of Adam do not inherit merely the physical (death, pain, etc.) and moral (ignorance, concupiscence) miseries that are the punishments of sin; they inherit sin itself: they are born sinners; for them there is not only fall, but also fault. How did the Greek theologians of the period which we are now considering, understand that twofold fall?

As to the fact that Adam transmitted the punishment of his sin to his posterity, and that the present physical and moral evils of mankind are due to Adam's sin, we can say that all agree and from that point of view formally reject Pelagianism. Leaving aside for the moment St. Cyril, whose pronouncements on this subject are quite numerous, Theodoret asserts that, as the sin of Adam made him mortal and subject to corruption, concupiscence, and sin, Adam begot children who, like himself, were subject to death and concupiscence;[74] that we all have been condemned to die, and that the whole of human nature has become captive in consequence of the sin of Adam.[75] In the *Eranistes*, III, he draws a very thorough parallel between Adam and Jesus Christ, and shows that men share in the former's punishment, as they do in the latter's triumph.[76] St. Maximus regards suffering, concupiscence, and death as consequences of the sin of Adam.[77] Similar texts are found in Theo-

[74] *In psalm.* L, v. 7 (col. 1244); *Quaest. in Genes.*, Interr. 37 (col. 136).

[75] *In psalm.* LX, v. 7, 8 (col. 1326); *Haeret. fabul. comp.*, V, 11 (col. 492).

[76] Col. 245 and foll.

[77] *Quaest. ad Thalassium*, qu. LXI (col. 632 and foll.); qu. XXI (col. 312).

dotus of Ancyra,[78] Proclus of Constantinople,[79] St. Nilus,[80] St. Isidore of Pelusium[81] and Anastasius Sinaita.[82]

On this point, then, there is no difficulty; but the same theologians who so explicitly assert that we suffer the punishment of Adam's sin, are far less definite in affirming that we inherit that sin itself. The Antiochian writers especially, who were so anxious to uphold the rights and integrity of human nature, must have felt most reluctant to adopt the Augustinian view. In fact, Theodoret rather opposes it. He lays it down as a principle that "the action of sin is not natural in us," and "that sin is not the product of nature, but of evil choosing;"[83] he gives to the ἐφ' ᾧ of *Rom.*, V, 12, the meaning of *because,* and adds that, in fact, "every one of us suffers the sentence of death, not because of the sin of our first parents, but because of his own sin" (*οὐ γὰρ διὰ τὴν τοῦ προπάτορος ἁμαρτίαν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν οἰκείαν*).[84] The *οἱ πολλοί* of *Rom.*, V, 19, is explained in the sense of *many.* Many have become sinners on account of the sin of Adam, as many have become just through the obedience of Jesus Christ: for there have been just men under the Old Law, as there are sinners under the covenant of grace.[85] Lastly, the Bishop of Cyrus observes that children are baptized, not because they have tasted sin (*οὐδέπω τῆς ἁμαρτίας*

[78] *Homil.* III, 3; VI, 8–10 (col. 1388, 1424 and foll.).
[79] *Homil.* XI (ap. Marius Mercator, *P. L.*, XLVIII, 779).
[80] *Peristeria,* X, 3 (*P. G.*, LXXIX, 889 and foll.).
[81] *Epist.* IV, 52, 204 (col. 1101, 1292).
[82] *Quaestio* 143 (col. 796).
[83] *In psalm.* L, v. 7 (col. 1244); *Eranistes,* I (col. 40).
[84] *In epist. ad Rom.*, V, 12 (col. 100). The contradiction between this remark and what has been said above, is merely on the surface. According to Theodoret, the sin of Adam brought on our death, because it caused in us concupiscence, the source of our own sins, which merit death for us.
[85] *In epist. ad Rom.*, V, 19 (col. 101, 104).

γευσάμενα), but because baptism does not only remit sins, but is also the token of future blessings.[86]

This last remark is found explicitly in the letter of Isidore of Pelusium to Herminius.[87] The Saint asks: Why are children baptized, since they are sinless? He answers by saying that some overparticular (σμικρολογοῦντες) people assert that, in baptism, those children "cast off the stain transfused into the nature because of Adam's transgression" (τὸν διὰ τὴν παράβασιν τοῦ Ἀδὰμ διαδοθέντα τῇ φύσει ῥύπον ἀποπλύνονται). He accepts that answer, but finds it insufficient and falls back upon the positive sanctifying effects of baptism.

Isidore of Pelusium deems the Latin explanation inadequate; however, as has just been said, he admits it as expressing a part of the truth.[88] Isidore belongs to St. Cyril's school, which realizes more deeply than that of Antioch man's need of God, and, as a matter of fact, it is rather in the writers who belong to the former that we meet, on the subject now before us, a doctrine which is similar to, though not perfectly identical with, the Augustinian teaching.

"Through Adam," Proclus of Constantinople writes, "we had all subscribed to sin": διὰ γὰρ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ πάντες τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἐχειρογραφήσαμεν.[89] As to Cyril himself, it is remarkable that he always sees in the condemnation and fall of the first man, the fall, not of a single individual, but of human nature. When Adam became disobedient, ἡ φύσις εὐθὺς θανάτῳ κατεδικάζετο.[90] Moreover, like St. Augustine, St. Cyril is not far from considering the concupiscence that accompanies the

[86] *Haeret. fabul. comp.*, V, 18 (col. 512).

[87] *Epist.* III, 195.

[88] It may be asked whether Isidore has in view the Latin theory or rather Origen's teaching (Cf. *History of Dogmas*, vol. I, p. 270, 271): both Origen and Isidore make use of the word ῥύπος.

[89] *Orat.* I, 5 (col. 685).

[90] *Glaph. in Genes.*, I (col. 21).

conjugal act as sinful.[91] Besides, he declares that "the hearts of all men have been stained, as it were, by the transgression *in* Adam and the perverse tendency to evil";[92] that, therefore, human nature has been turned away from God (ἐν ἀποστροφῇ τοῦ θεοῦ),[93] outside His friendship (ἔξω τῆς πρὸς θεὸν οἰκειότητος);[94] that we have been corrupted in Adam ('Αδὰμ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἐφθάρμεθα),[95] and become sick through the death of sin at the prompting of the serpent.[96] This is apparently the Latin formula; what follows will show that these writers are really still far from it. We incur our first parent's punishment, writes St. Cyril, because we have *imitated* his sin.[97] In the same commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, he states his thought more fully. After saying that "we have been condemned in Adam, and that from him, as from a first root, death, the fruit of the curse, has passed into what is born of him," he raises this objection: But how can Adam's fault be imputed to us, since we did not even exist at the time of his sin? Cyril answers that, since impure desires invaded Adam's body after he had sinned, they also invaded our bodies, and thus "nature has contracted the disease of sin" (νενόσηκεν οὖν ἡ φύσις τὴν ἁμαρτίαν). This is why, he goes on to say, "many have been made sinners, not because they have sinned in Adam,— they were not yet in existence,— but because they are of the same nature as he, a nature that has fallen under the law of sin."[98] Of course, this is not the Augustinian theory of original sin properly so called; the texts just quoted

[91] *In psalm.* L, v. 7 (col. 1092).
[92] *In psalm.* L, v. 12 (col. 1100); *In Ioannem,* XII (col. 656).
[93] *In psalm.* L, v. 13 (col. 1100).
[94] *In psalm.* LXXVIII, v. 8 (col. 1197).
[95] *Quod unus sit Christus* (col. 1272).
[96] *In psalm.* XXIX (col. 856).
[97] *In epist. ad Rom.,* V, 12 (col. 784).
[98] *In epist. ad Rom.,* V, 18, 20 (col. 788, 789); *De recta fide ad regin.,* I, 3 (col. 1205).

speak of death and of an inclination to actual sin, an inclination which is indeed a falling away, a corruption, an evil, a "law of sin" that comes to us through generation, but which Cyril does not plainly call sin.

The Greek theologians of the 5th, 6th, and 7th centuries, then, but imperfectly understood the meaning of the Occidental decisions against Pelagianism on the particular point we are now considering.[99] Probably they had not studied those decisions.

Were they better acquainted with the nature and necessity of grace?

We may reasonably doubt it.[100] Their teaching does not show much progress over that of their predecessors; at all events, it certainly remains outside the influence of that of St. Augustine. On one hand, like their predecessors, the authors before us assert that human nature has not been thoroughly vitiated by the fall, but is capable, even in pagans, of producing fruits of virtue. There are men, Theodoret observes, who know neither piety nor divine teachings, and yet perform good works.[101] On the other hand, the same writers assert just as strongly that without grace, man cannot be saved, avoid sin on all occasions, repent of his faults, practise good as he ought, acquire virtues and carry out his good resolutions:

"No one can be saved, unless through the divine help."[102] —"Without God's help, all minds are weak; with the help and

[99] The contrary cannot be inferred from the text of St. Maximus in his letter to Marinus (*P. G.*, XCI, 136), in connection with the teaching of the Latins about the exemption of Christ from original sin.

[100] However, on this as well as on the preceding subject, we must except the Scythian monks already mentioned (p. 124), who, as we shall see later, professed the whole Augustinian system (cf., below, p. 286 and foll.).

[101] *Quaest. in Levitic.*, Interrog. II (col. 316).

[102] Cyril, *In psalm.* XXXII, v. 1 (col. 869).

strength which He grants in His benignity, whatever was weak shall be made strong and avoid shipwreck." [103]—" It is beyond the power of those who wish to lead a holy life, to do so, unless they are called." [104]—" All men, even those who are adorned with acts of virtue, need divine grace." [105]—" [The Apostle] looks upon our having believed and fought a noble fight as a gift of God, not in order to deny the freedom of the will, but to teach us that, without grace, the will cannot by itself perform the proper kind of good." [106]—" No one can, without divine grace, walk in the path of virtue." [106a]

These expressions are from St. Cyril and Theodoret, and we could easily quote many similar texts from these [107] and other authors, *e.g.,* Isidore of Pelusium,[108] St. Nilus,[109] and St. Maximus.[110] All these writers carefully observe that human freedom remains intact under the action of grace, and that, in order to become effective, grace requires our coöperation. " Both are needed," Theodoret writes, " *viz.,* our industry (ἐπιθυμία) and the divine help. The grace of the Spirit does not suffice to the sluggard, nor can activity, when it is devoid of grace, gather the riches of virtue." [111]

All this is correct; but what concerns us most, is to know whether or not these writers make the most of their asser-

[103] *Id., In psalm.* XXXVI, v. 24 (col. 941).
[104] *Id., In Lucam,* XIII, v. 23 (col. 776).
[105] Theodoret, *In psalm.* XXXI, v. 10, 11 (col. 1092, 1093).
[106] *Id., In epist. ad Philipp.,* I, v. 29, 30 (col. 568).
[106a] *Id., In psalm.* XXXVI, v. 23, 24 (col. 1132); cf. *In psalm.* LXXXIX, v. 17 (col. 1608).
[107] Cyril, *In psalm.* III, v. 6 (col. 728); XXIX (col. 856); Theodoret, *In Ezechiel.,* XXXVI, v. 26 (col. 1184).
[108] *Epist.* IV, 171.
[109] *Epist.* II, 228; IV, 15.
[110] *Capit. quinq. centen.,* centur. IV, 13 (col. 1309).
[111] *In epist. ad Philipp.,* I, v. 29, 30 (col. 568); *In epist. II ad Corinth.,* VIII, v. 1 (col. 421); *Graec. affec. curatio,* V (col. 924, 925); Isid. Pelus., *Epist.* IV, 51; St. Maximus, *Quaest. ad Thalass.,* qu. LIX (col. 608).

tion of the necessity of grace for the practice of salutary acts, and demand grace for the beginning of every good deed, nay even for the mere desire of good. It is but fair to observe that they did not explicitly raise this question; no wonder, therefore, that the solutions they give seem often more or less inconsistent. In many a place they suppose that the good dispositions of the soul and human efforts precede grace and draw it down into the subject.[112] "There is a faith that depends upon us (ἐφ' ἡμῖν)," St. Cyril writes, "and a faith that is a divine gift. For it is in our power to begin and place our trust and faith in God with all our might, and it pertains to God's grace to make us persevering and firm therein." [113] Again, after saying that without divine help we cannot perform any good in the present life, and that we must not ascribe to ourselves entirely the trophies of victory, St. Nilus continues: "For all that we can do is to choose what is best and strive after it; and [it belongs] to God to grant to our good desires their fulfilment." [114]

As regards the questions that refer to the distribution of graces, their proper use and the value they impart to our actions, we find many indications in the works of moralists like St. Isidore, St. Nilus, and others. We notice a few: At times God abandons obstinate sinners and completely withdraws His help from them.[115] Faith does not suffice for salvation, but must be accompanied by good works.[116] These good works will obtain their reward

[112] Theodoret, *In epist. ad Ephes.*, VI, v. 24 (col. 557); *In epist. ad Philipp.*, II, v. 13 (col. 573); *In Epist. I ad Timoth.*, IV, v. 13 (col. 816); *Graec. affect. curat.*, V (col. 924, 925); Isidor. Pelus., *Epist.* IV, 13.

[113] *In Lucam*, XVII, 5 (col. 832).

[114] *Epist.* IV, 15.

[115] Cyril, *In psalm.* XXXVII, v. 12 (col. 964); Theodoret, *In psalm.* CXVIII, v. 8 (col. 1824).

[116] Theodoret, *In epist. I ad Timoth.*, II, v. 2 (col. 797); *In epist. ad Titum*, III, v. 8 (col. 869); Isid. Pelus., *Epist.* IV, 65.

(μισθός) and make us secure with God.[117] Yet, notwithstanding their meritorious character, they are not proportionate to the eternal blessings they obtain for us, for they are only temporary; those blessings remain a grace which God bestows upon us.[118]

§ 4. Soteriology.[119]

The Christological controversies which we have set forth at length in the beginning of this volume, engrossed the Christian mind chiefly because of their great importance from the soteriological point of view. The Redeemer was both God and man; the school of Alexandria insisted mainly on his divine character; that of Antioch endeavored to safeguard His human nature. Under this aspect, the exposition of the soteriology of the Greek writers from the 5th to the 7th century cannot be separated from that of their Christology. But this point of view does not embrace the whole subject. Once the Redeemer's perfect godhead and perfect manhood have been proclaimed, it may be asked how and in what way He effected the work of reparation and reconciliation. The present paragraph has for its object to study the various solutions given to this problem during the period under review.

As the reader may recall, the three fundamental theories of Christology — the speculative or mystical theory, the realistic theory, and the theory of the devil's rights — are found in the early Greek theology, quite often in the same writer. At the epoch we are studying, the last mentioned theory is not expressed in the juridical and strict form under which St. Gregory of Nyssa had presented it. The death

[117] Theodoret, *In Isaiam*, LVIII, v. 9 (col. 457); Isid. Pelus., *Epist.* I, 13.

[118] Theodoret, *In epist. ad Rom.*, VI, v. 23 (col. 113).

[119] Cf. J. Rivière, *Le dogme de la Rédemption*, Paris, 1905, chapt. XII (English transl.).

of Jesus Christ is no longer described as a ransom paid to Satan, which he had the right to demand; our authors look upon it rather as an abuse of power on the part of Satan, who might indeed have rightly claimed the death of sinful and guilty mankind,— *stipendium peccati mors,*— but who has committed an injustice by procuring the death of Jesus Christ, and by that crime forfeited, according to the rules of equity, even the right he had over the guilty. His rapacity brought about his own downfall; hell was not able to hold the God hidden in Jesus Christ under the bait of human nature, and had to give back even those men whom it had already swallowed. This rather picturesque and simple way of explaining our deliverance through the Savior, is already found in St. John Chrysostom;[120] later on it is re-echoed by St. Cyril,[121] Theodoret,[122] St. Isidore of Pelusium,[123] St. Maximus,[124] and others.[125] However, it was but a poetic and oratorical fashion of expressing the moral struggle between the principle of good and salvation, Jesus Christ, and the principle of evil and damnation, Satan.

On the other hand, the speculative theory which attributes to the Incarnation, considered in itself, a redeeming efficacy, through the fact of its bringing together God and humanity more closely in the person of the Word Incarnate, seems to be on the wane. However, no one will be surprised to find it still in St. Cyril of Alexandria. It was, as it were, a part of the tradition of his church, and fitted in so well with his Christology as a whole, that he could hardly fail

[120] *In Ioannem,* homil. LXVIII, 2, 3; *In epist. ad Rom.,* hom. XIII, 5.
[121] *De recta fide ad regin.,* II, 31 (col. 1376).
[122] *De providentia,* X (col. 757–761); *De incarn. Domini,* XI (col. 1433–1436).
[123] *Epist.* IV, 166 (col. 1257).
[124] *Capit. quinq. centen.,* cent. I, 11 (col. 1184).
[125] Cf. Rivière, *op. cit.,* p. 431 and foll. (English transl., vol. II, p. 176 and foll.).

to adopt it. "Is it not evident and manifest to every man," he writes, "that the Unbegotten One has become like unto us, *i.e.*, a perfect man, to free our earthly body from the corruption that had invaded it? [This is why] He was willing to become identical with us in His life through the economy of the [hypostatic] union and took a human soul, making it superior to sin, and clothing it, as it were, with the firmness and immutability of His own nature." [126] Similar formulas are found in his commentary on St. John.[127] However, they are but an introduction to the deeper, fuller and more realistic theory which we must now examine.

"Had Jesus Christ not died for us, we should not have been saved." [128] This sentence of St. Cyril, taken by itself, shows that he did not deem the Incarnation sufficient for our redemption. But why and how does the death of Jesus Christ save us? The holy Doctor answers this question in many texts that make his teaching on this point the synopsis and most perfect expression of the teaching of the Greek Church. All previous views of the Christian mind are reproduced and carefully noted. Jesus Christ is our ransom (*ἀντάλλαγμα, ἀντίλυτρον*); [129] He is a victim, who offered Himself as a sacrifice for sin; of that victim the paschal lamb and the emissary goat were figures.[130] This last comparison leads us to the idea of penal substitution. Jesus Christ was personally innocent, and consequently could not be punished nor chastised; but He took upon Himself our sins; He became malediction for us; henceforth "that chastisement which was reserved for sinners, that they might cease to war against God, fell upon Him.

[126] *De incarn. Unigen.* (col. 1213).
[127] *In Ioann.*, IX (col. 272–282).
[128] Cyril, *Glaph. in Exodum*, II (col. 437).
[129] *De adorat. in spir. et ver.*, XV (col. 972); *Glaph. in Exod.*, II (col. 480); *Quod unus sit Christus* (col. 1337).
[130] *Glaph. in Exod.*, II (col. 425); *In Levitic.* (col. 588, 589).

. . . God delivered Him on account of our sins;" [131] "He made Him suffer what was due to the greatest sinners." [132] By His death and sacrifice, He paid, and through Him we too paid what we owed for our sins.[133] He *expiated* our sins;[134] He destroyed the enmity that existed between us and the Father, and reconciled us to Him.[135] Hence, sin being destroyed, death, which is a consequence of sin, must also disappear.[136]

All these ideas had been already expressed before St. Cyril. What characterizes his teaching is the emphasis with which he insists, on the one hand, that the sufferings of Christ represent the punishment due to our sins, and on the other, that the reparation He made for us is adequate, nay, superabundant. He remarks often that the ransom paid by Jesus Christ is ἀντάξιος;[137] and that Christ, who died for us all, surpassed us all in worth and dignity (ὁ πάντων ἀξιώτερος),[138] because He is no ordinary man, nor even God's adopted Son only, but the Word Incarnate, superior to every creature.[139] The adequacy of the atonement is not merely a fact. Justice demanded that the ransom should equal in value those who were to be redeemed: "One alone,

[131] *In Isaiam,* LIII, v. 4-6 (col. 1176 and the whole passage).
[132] *In Epist. II ad Corinth.* (col. 945).
[133] *De adorat. in spir. et verit.,* III (col. 293, 296).
[134] *De recta fide ad regin.,* II, 7 (col. 1344).
[135] *Quod unus sit Christus* (col. 1356); *De ador. in spir. et verit.,* III (col. 292).
[136] *In Ioan.,* II (col. 192). These two results — the deliverance of the soul from sin and the restoration of immortality to our bodies, are the two ends of redemption, on which Cyril dwells again and again, according to *Romans,* VIII, 3, 4, and *Hebrews,* II, 14, 15, which he quotes frequently.
[137] *Glaph. in Levitic.* (col. 548); *De recta fide ad Theodos.,* 21 (col. 1164); etc.
[138] *Quod unus sit Christus* (col. 1356); *Epist.* XXXI (col. 152); *In Ioannem,* II (col. 192); *In Isaiam,* LIII, v. 4-6 (col. 1176); etc.
[139] *Quod unus sit Christus* (col. 1341).

He who was the exact equivalent of the lives of all, had to die for all." [140] This principle in the hands of Cyril quite naturally becomes a weapon against Nestorius. St. Cyril constantly insists that the ransom offered by Jesus Christ must have been equivalent, and thence concludes that Christ, as man, is one and the same person with the Word; for no man, however exalted in grace, could by his death have furnished a sufficient and efficacious expiation for our sins.[141] Thus the need of rendering an adequate satisfaction shows that the Redeemer who was able to make this expiation, is God,— which truth, in turn, proves the concrete adequacy, nay superabundance of the satisfaction rendered.

As has been said, St. Cyril's soteriological teaching represents the culminating point of the speculations of the Greek Church on this subject. After him, these speculations cease to be original, with the exception, first, of a discourse by Proclus, patriarch of Constantinople, setting forth briefly but eloquently the need of the death of a God to pay our debt and the superabundance of that expiation,[142] and, second, of a letter in which St. Isidore of Pelusium [143] explains the text "*Ad ostensionem iustitiae suae*" and shows that "Jesus Christ [is] the sole victim offered for all, and more excellent than all," appeasing the divine wrath, restoring peace, changing hatred into friendship and regaining for us the grace of adopted sonship. Theodoret contents himself with explaining the classical theory of realism, to wit: Jesus Christ is substituted for us; He became malediction for us; He underwent the chastisement in our stead;

[140] *In Ioannem*, XI (col. 585).

[141] *De recta fide ad reg.*, I, 7 (col. 1208, 1289–1297); *Epist.* L (col. 264).

[142] *Orat.* I, 5–9 (col. 685–689). See also *Orat.* II, 2; XI, 4; XIV, 2 (col. 693, 785, 796, 797); *Epist.* II, 7 (col. 861).

[143] *Epist.* IV, 100 (col. 1165); cf. *Epist.* IV, 166 (col. 1257).

His death was our ransom, or rather, as the author expressly observes, "a sort of ransom" (*οἷόν τι λύτρον*);[144] it was also a free and spontaneous sacrifice, destined to atone for our faults. Thus our debt was paid, and we were reconciled to God.[145] The LIIId chapter of Isaias furnished these authors with an important contribution for their exposition of the realistic theory; and it is explained in the same sense by Procopius of Gaza (+ about 528).[146]

§ 5. Ecclesiology.

There was hardly any progress made from the 5th to the 7th century in the teaching of the Greek theologians regarding the Church, considered as the assembly of the faithful and in her mystical relations to Jesus Christ. The Church had often been described as the city of God, the new Jerusalem, the spouse of Jesus Christ, the spotless virgin, the enclosed garden, etc. St. Cyril, who loves to dwell on these comparisons, merely repeats what had been said by his predecessors. However, the creed quoted by St. Epiphanius (which later came to be regarded as that of the Second General Council), contained an article affirming belief *εἰς μίαν, ἁγίαν, καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν*. Commenting that formula, as it were, Greek theologians affirmed that there was but one Church of Christ, and that this Church, notwithstanding the diversity of the particular churches of which it is made up, is one. This unity rests on the unity of faith (*τῇ συμφωνίᾳ τῶν ἀληθῶν δογμάτων*),[147] on the fact that the faithful do not disagree in doctrine (*διχόνοια, πνευματικὴ*

[144] *In epist. ad Rom.*, III, 24; *In epist. I ad Timoth.*, II, 6 (col. 84, 800).

[145] *In Daniel.*, IX, 24 (col. 1472); *In Isaiam*, LIII, 4-12 (col. 441–444); *In epist. ad Rom.*, V, 8 (col. 97); *In epist. ad Ephes.*, II, 14 (col. 524); *De providentia*, X (col. 754–757).

[146] *In Isaiam*, LIII (*P. G.*, LXXXVII, 2, col. 2521–2532).

[147] Theodoret, *In psalm.* XLVII, v. 4 (col. 1213).

διαίρεσις), and on the unity of baptism.[148] There is no mention of the unity of rule. The teaching of that Church which is one (so runs the argument), must be true, and its discipline holy. The Church, says St. Maximus, is "the orthodox and salutary confession of the faith, ἡ ὀρθὴ καὶ σωτήριος τῆς πίστεως ὁμολογία." [149] Somewhat earlier Isidore of Pelusium had more completely defined her as "the assembly of the saints who are united by the true faith and the most perfect discipline," τὸ ἄθροισμα τῶν ἁγίων τὸ ἐξ ὀρθῆς πίστεως καὶ πολιτείας ἀρίστης συνκεκροτημένον.[150] Hence the conclusion that no one can be saved except in the Church. "Outside the holy city," writes St. Cyril, "no mercy can be obtained." [151] On the other hand the Church is catholic, destined for all, and she can be perceived by all.[152] The work of the Apostles is continued by her priests; her first bishops were called Apostles.[153]

To the bishops, and in general to the clergy, as opposed to the laity, belong the first rank and the government of the Christian community. The clergy, says Theodoret, are as it were the face of the Church, because of their preëminent dignity.[154] Their power comes from God, and the laity have no right to judge them; [155] even princes are inferior to them in dignity.[156] This last point remains true at least in theory,

[148] Theodoret, *In Cantic. cantic.*, III, cap. VI, v. 1 (col. 165); Cyril, *In psalm.* XLIV, v. 10 (col. 1041).

[149] *Vita ac certamen*, XXIV (*P. G.*, XC, 93).

[150] *Epist.* II, 246 (col. 685); cf. *Epist.* IV, 5 (col. 1053); Cyril, *In Ioannem*, IX (col. 217).

[151] *In psalm.* XXXI, v. 22 (col. 865).

[152] Cyril, *In Isaiam*, I (col. 68); *In Lucam*, X, v. 34 (col. 681).

[153] Theodoret, *In Isaiam*, LXI, v. 6 (col. 472); *In epist. I ad Corinth.*, III, v. 1 (col. 804).

[154] *In psalm.* XLV, v. 13 (col. 1196); *In epist. I ad Timoth.*, V, v. 21 (col. 821).

[155] Theodoret, *De providentia*, orat. VIII (col. 684); St. Nilus, *Epist.* II, 261 (col. 333); Pseudo-Dion., *Epist.* VIII (col. 1088).

[156] Theodoret, *Quaest. in Levit.*, Interr. I (col. 308); Isid. Pelus., *Epist.* IV, 219 (col. 1313).

and when the emperors became heretics or favored heresy, the victims of their persecution came forward and recalled it to them. In practice, however, there grew up in the East, mainly during the 5th century, what may be called theological Byzantinism, *i.e.*, a constant meddling of the civil power with the government of the Church and interference in doctrinal conflicts. The emperor convoked and dissolved councils, approved or rejected their decisions, put forth confessions of faith and obliged the episcopate to subscribe to them, deposed refractory patriarchs and bishops almost at will; briefly, he regarded ecclesiastical matters as lying within his supreme jurisdiction. To this state of things the Greek Church, as a whole, gradually accustomed itself, though not without complaints and many strong protests from noble-minded priests and bishops. Unfortunately, this situation was, at least in part, owing to a mistake that had been made by that Church herself in granting to the patriarch of Constantinople — the patriarch of the imperial court — exceptional dignity and authority. The Council of 381 gave him second rank, next to the bishop of Rome, because he resided in the new Rome, the Rome of the East. This hurt and weakened Alexandria. The Council of Chalcedon made matters still worse by suppressing the autonomy of the dioceses of Pontus and Asia (Neocæsarea and Ephesus), making them subject to Constantinople, and by decreasing the prestige and strength of that of Antioch through the creation of a patriarchate at Jerusalem. All these changes, made on the theory that the authority of the patriarch must be commensurate with the civil importance of a city, naturally led people to think that in a Christian community the bishop held, if not his essential power, at least the domain of his jurisdiction, from the civil power, and that, consequently, the temporal ruler had the right to make ecclesiastical laws. Nothing was more detrimental to the

independence of the Church and the purity of her dogma. The patriarch of Constantinople became the most influential bishop of the East and was at the beck of a ruler surrounded by flatterers.

The Popes, notably St. Leo,[157] raised their voices against decisions which ignored established rights and prepared a schism by creating rivals to the papacy itself. The event proved the correctness of their apprehensions. However, their authority was acknowledged in principle by the Greek Church, and was never more actively exercised than during the period which extends from the 5th to the middle of the 6th century.

St. Peter, the founder of the Roman Church, continued to be looked upon by the writers of that era as the first, the leader, the corypheus of the Apostolic College, *πρῶτος, πρόκριτος, κορυφαῖος τῶν ἀποστόλων.*[158] True, the word *rock* in *Matt.*, XVI, 18, was not always referred to the person of the Apostle. Cyril applies it to Christ;[159] Cyril, Theodoret and Isidore of Pelusium, to the faith of St. Peter, solid as a rock, upon which the Church is built.[160] But the term is also applied to the person of the Apostle. Thus the same St. Cyril says that Simon was given the name of Peter, "because Christ intended to found His Church upon him (*ἐπ' αὐτῷ*)."[161] St. Maximus the Confessor expresses himself in a similar manner.[162] St. Cyril confirms this interpreta-

[157] *Epist.* CIV, CV, CVI, CXIV.

[158] Cyril, *In Ioannem,* XII (col. 661); *De ss. Trinitate,* dial. IV (col. 865); Theodoret, *Quaest. in Genes.,* Interr. 110 (col. 220); *Haeret. fabul. comp.* (col. 449); *In psalm.* II (col. 821, 873) etc.; Isid. Pelus., *Epist.* II, 58 (col. 504), 99 (col. 544); St. Nilus, *Epist.* II, 261 (col. 333).

[159] *In Isaiam,* III (col. 729).

[160] Cyril, *In Isaiam,* IV (col. 740); *De ss. Trinitate,* dial. IV (col. 865); Theodoret, *Quaest. in Exod.,* Interrog. 68 (col. 293); Isid. Pelus., *Epist.* I, 235 (col. 328).

[161] *In Ioannem,* II (col. 220).

[162] *Vita ac certamen,* XXIV (*P. G.,* XC, 93).

tion in his commentary on the phrase: "*Confirma fratres tuos:*" "Be the solid foundation and teacher (στήριγμα καὶ διδάσκαλος) of those who belong to me through faith."[163]

Such a recognition of the primacy of St. Peter indirectly implied a recognition of that of the Pope. There are other texts and facts which bespeak this belief directly and positively and prove beyond a doubt that, at the time of which we are speaking, the East beheld in the bishop of Rome a bishop invested with superior authority, whose assent was needed to settle all matters of importance concerning the Church. In his XIth letter to Pope Celestine, St. Cyril, himself a patriarch, does not call him "brother," but "father," and adds that he — Cyril — felt himself bound by a long-standing custom to acquaint the Pope with such cases as that of Nestorius, and consult him before taking any action.[164] In his XIth homily, the same Cyril calls Celestine "the ecumenical archbishop" (ἀρχιεπίσκοπος πάσης τῆς οἰκουμένης).[165] In the second session of the Council of Ephesus, Firmus of Cæsarea declared that Nestorius need not be judged again, since "a decision, a sentence has been passed about him" (ψῆφον καὶ τύπον): that of the Pope.[166] Flavian of Constantinople and Eusebius of Doryleum, when they were deposed by the *latrocinium* of Ephesus, appealed to St. Leo. Theodoret, too, when he was deposed, appealed to Pope Leo, in his CXIIIth letter, which plainly affirms the Roman primacy.[167] At the Council of Chalcedon the

[163] *In Lucam*, XXII, v. 32 (col. 916).
[164] *Epist.* XI, 1, 7 (col. 80, 84).
[165] *Homil. divers.*, XI (*P. G.*, LXXVII, 1040).
[166] MANSI, IV, 1288.
[167] "If Paul, the herald of the truth, the trumpet of the Holy Ghost, hastened to the great Peter to obtain from him and to communicate to those at Antioch the solution of the difficulties which divided them on the question of legal observances, how much more do we, insignificant men and small, hasten to your Apostolic See in order to receive from you a cure for the wounds of the churches. For every reason it is

Pope's legates preside over the enactment of resolutions and definitions; and in their synodal letter to St. Leo, the Fathers of the Council ask him "to honor their decree by his assent," to impart "strength and confirmation" to what has been decreed, and to deal rightly with them, the children of his sovereignty.[168] Again, in the year 483, it was to the Pope that John Talaia had recourse when driven from Alexandria. In 519, the Greeks subscribed to the celebrated formula of Hormisdas, which plainly asserts the primacy of the Roman Church and her indefectibility in the true faith, and emphatically declares that, to be in communion with the Church, one must be in communion with the Apostolic See.[169] In 544, Mennas of Constantinople, while subscribing to Justinian's condemnation of the Three Chapters, appeals to the judgment of the Pope.[170] Besides, the Popes constantly intervened in the East in connection with the Monothelite controversies, and their intervention was asked for and accepted.[171] Agatho's intervention was as decisive as that of St. Leo at Chalcedon, and the bishops of the 6th general Council, after enthusiastically declaring that "Peter has spoken through Agatho,"[172] in an address to the Pope proclaimed him the πρωτοθρόνος τῆς οἰκουμενικῆς ἐκκλησίας, established "upon the solid rock of the faith," and asked his "paternal holiness" to deign to confirm the sentence they had passed.[173]

fitting that you hold the first place, inasmuch as your see is adorned with many privileges. . . . I await the sentence of your Apostolic See, etc." Cf. the rest of the text quoted above, p. 85, note. (*P. G.*, LXXXIII, 1312–1317.)

[168] Mansi, VI, 153, 156.

[169] *P. L.*, LXIII, 443, 447, 448.

[170] Facundus, *Pro def. trium capit.*, IV, 4; *Liber contra Mocianum* (*P. L.*, LXVII, 625, 626, 861).

[171] Mansi, X, 913–916, 890 and foll.

[172] Mansi, XI, 665.

[173] Mansi, XI, 684, 688.

The true significance of these texts and facts is confirmed by Socrates and Sozomen in their account of the Arian controversy. Though both are Orientals, they unhesitatingly grant the legitimacy of the papal claims.[174] These claims are confirmed by St. Maximus in a letter written, it is true, from Rome, but which is nevertheless of capital importance. We quote:

"From the moment when the Divine Logos came down into our midst and became incarnate, all the Christian churches throughout the world received and possess the very great [Church] which is here, for their only basis and foundation. For, according to the promise of the Savior Himself, it cannot be overthrown by the gates of hell; it possesses the keys of the orthodox faith in Him and His confession, and it opens to all those who come with piety [the springs] of the only lawful religion, whereas it shuts and silences every heretical mouth that shouts wickedness on the heights." [175]

From all of which it is evident that the Greek theologians who wrote from the 5th to the 7th century, beheld in the bishop of Rome a bishop superior to all others in dignity and authority, one with whom all genuine Christians must be in communion, and to whom an appeal could be made even from the decisions of Oriental patriarchs and councils. No doubt, the Popes claimed something more, while the Greeks in practice often gave the lie to their principles. On two occasions, first in connection with the Henoticon (484–519), and later in connection with Monothelitism (668–678), the Greek Church became schismatic and separated itself from Rome. The 5th General Council was held in spite of Vigilius, whose name it struck from the diptychs; Honorius was condemned as an accomplice of

[174] Socrates, *Hist. eccles.*, II, 8, 15, 17; Sozomen, *Hist. eccles.*, II, 8.
[175] *P. G.*, XCI, 137, 140.

heresy by the 6th General Council, and Epiphanius and John the Faster, patriarchs of Constantinople, arrogated the title of ecumenical patriarchs. These facts show that the Greeks bore the yoke impatiently, but they do not weaken the acknowledged right of the Pope; and it is interesting to notice how this right forced its way even in the midst of revolt. Thus, while striking the name of Vigilius from the diptychs, Justinian and the Council of 553 nevertheless declared their intention to remain in communion with the Apostolic See, so strongly were they persuaded that, unless they were in communion with Rome, they could not belong to the Church.

§ 6. The Sacraments. Baptism. Confirmation.

In the preceding paragraph we have considered the ecclesiastical hierarchy as a ruling power. Pseudo-Dionysius looks upon it rather as a sanctifying power: bishops, priests and deacons are *hierurgi,* whose business it is to initiate into the mysteries the candidates who apply for admission and to confer sacraments, which are sensible signs and images of intelligible things and lead men to them.[176] Dionysius mentions six such signs or mysteries: baptism, confirmation or unction, the Eucharist, orders, the monastic profession, and funerals.[177] This list was repeated later by other writers; we merely observe that, following St. Cyril's[178] example, Dionysius groups together the three sacraments of Christian initiation,— baptism, confirmation, and the Eucharist.[179]

In connection with the Eucharist and baptism, Isidore of Pelusium explicitly notes that they are not vitiated by the

[176] Ἔστι γὰρ τὰ μὲν αἰσθητῶς ἱερὰ τῶν νοητῶν ἀπεικονίσματα, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτὰ χειραγωγία καὶ ὁδός (*De eccl. hier.,* II, 3, 2, col. 397).

[177] *De eccl. hier.,* II–VII.

[178] *In Ioelem,* XXXII, col. 573.

[179] *De eccl. hier.,* II, 2, 7; 3, 8 (col. 396, 404).

misbehavior of the minister who confers them.[180] But another question soon arose: What about the validity of the sacraments when administered by heretics?[181] Owing to a lack of perfect agreement on this point among the Oriental theologians of the 5th century, various answers were given. First, a distinction was made between heretics and heretics. The Council of Nicæa (can. 8) admitted the validity of baptism and ordination conferred by the Novatians, demanding only that converts should be reconciled by the imposition of hands. The baptism and ordination of the Paulianists, on the other hand, were declared null (can. 19). As to the clerics ordained by the schismatic Meletius, the same Council decided that they were to be "confirmed by a holier imposition of hands," *μυστικωτέρᾳ χειροτονίᾳ βεβαιωθέντες*,[182] a supplementary ceremony which must not be regarded as a reordination, but merely as an affirmation of the rights of the patriarch of Alexandria.

During the 5th century, in Syria, there was no definite teaching.[183] The Apostolic Canons (No. 68) declare that every bishop, priest or deacon, who has allowed himself to be reordained, shall be deposed, together with him by whom he was reordained, unless it can be proved that the first ordination was performed by heretics: "for those that are either baptized or ordained by heretics, can be neither Christians nor clerics:" *Τοὺς γὰρ παρὰ τοιούτων (αἱρετικῶν) βαπτισθέντας ἢ χειροτονθέντας οὔτε πιστοὺς οὔτε κληρικοὺς εἶναι δυνατόν.* Conformably, then, to the Apostolic Constitutions (VI, 15),

[180] *Epist.* II, 37; III, 340 (col. 480, 1000).

[181] On this particular point, cf. L. Saltet, *Les réordinations*, Paris, 1907.

[182] Socrates, *Hist. eccles.*, I, 9; Sozomen, *Hist. eccl.*, I, 15. Sozomen says that Bishop Peter of Alexandria rejected the baptism of the Meletians.

[183] Except as regards confirmation, which continued to be the means by which heretics were reconciled, and which they were not believed to administer validly.

the author of that canon does not admit the validity of baptism and ordination when administered by heretics. However, as it is the Apostles who are supposed to speak in this canon, no distinction is made among heretics even though such a distinction may have existed. The anonymous author of the *Quaestiones et responsiones ad orthodoxos,*[184] who wrote during the 5th century and in the patriarchate of Antioch, contents himself with demanding, for the sacraments administered by heretics, a few corrections which will render them lawful and make their repetition unnecessary. In the 14th question, he first asserts that the baptism and ordination of heretics are, as a matter of fact, not repeated. But, he asks, if the baptism conferred by heretics is false and empty (ἐψευσμένον καὶ μάταιον), why is not a heretic rebaptized when he becomes a convert? Why is his ordination deemed valid (βεβαία)? He answers that the convert's heresy is healed by his new profession of faith, his baptism by the unction of the holy chrism, and his ordination (χειροτονία) by a laying on of hands (χειροθεσία). He tells us nothing definite about that χειροθεσία.

During the first half of the 5th century, there was, then, no definite teaching as to the value of the sacraments of heretics in Syria. Because of the ensuing uncertainty, Martyrius, patriarch of Antioch (460–470), addressed himself to Constantinople to obtain some practical advice on the subject. The answer he received is still extant. It declares that the Church authorities at Constantinople regard the baptism of the Arians, Macedonians, Sabbatians, Novatians, Quartodecimans, and Apollinarianists as valid, and reconcile them by the unction of chrism; but their ordinations to the priesthood, diaconate, subdiaconate, cantorate and lectorate, are not accepted; those who have received

[184] This work is found among the *Spuria* of St. Justin. Edit. Otto, III, 2; *P. G.*, v. VI.

these ordinations are looked upon only as laymen. As to the Eunomians, Montanists, Sabellians, and all other heretics, not even their baptism is held valid, and those who have received it are regarded as heathens.[185]

Briefly, the Church authorities at Constantinople were more exacting in regard to ordination than in regard to baptism, absolutely rejecting the orders of all heretics. Was this line of action followed also regarding the new sects, Nestorianism and Monophysitism? It does not seem to have been followed at the beginning. The Monophysites themselves, Timothy II of Alexandria and Severus of Antioch, did not follow it towards the Dyophysites who joined their sect.[186] Severus, in particular, was unwilling to reconcile repentant Dyophysites by confirmation; he deems that sacrament valid among Catholics.[187] Later on, a patriarch of Constantinople, John the Scholastic (565–577), tried to change this practice; after admitting for a while the validity of Monophysite ordinations, he made an attempt to impose some episcopal and other reordinations by force. The attempt was frustrated by the strong opposition of those who were to be its victims and by the Emperor's protest.[188] At

[185] G. Beveridge, *Synodicon sive pandectae,* etc., Oxford, 1672, II, Annotationes, p. 100; quoted by Saltet, *op. cit.,* p. 41.

[186] There was even a schism on this occasion in the Monophysite church of Alexandria. Some zealots refused to acknowledge the ordinations conferred by the Catholic patriarch Proterius, Timothy's predecessor, and rejected communion with the latter. These details, found in a letter of Severus (cf. below) and in a spurious letter of Philoxenus to Abou-Niphir (*Revue de l'Orient chrétien,* 1903, pp. 623 and foll.), are followed, in this last document, by a theory of the author (a Monophysite) on the validity of the sacraments administered by heretics, a theory very similar to that of the Donatists, recorded by St. Augustine, *Contra Cresconium,* II, 21. Baptism and ordination, when conferred by occult heretics, are valid; when conferred by professed heretics, null (*Revue,* quoted above, p. 629, 630).

[187] E. W. Brooks, *The sixth Book of the select Letters of Severus,* II, p. 180 and foll.

[188] *Die Kirchengeschichte des Johannes von Ephesus* (edit. J. M.

the beginning of the 7th century, the priest Timothy, in his *De receptione haereticorum,*[189] divided the heretics to be reconciled into three categories: (1) those whose baptism must be renewed, or rather those who need to be baptized; (2) those who have to be anointed with the holy chrism, *i.e.,* confirmed; and (3) those who have been validly baptized and confirmed, and who have only to retract their errors. Among the first he mentions, besides some heretics hardly known to us, the Marcionites, the Saccophori and the Encratites, the followers of Valentinus and Basilides, the Montanists, the Manicheans, and the Eunomians, the followers of Paul of Samosata, Photinus, and Marcellus of Ancyra, the Sabellians, the Simonians, and the ancient Gnostics, and lastly the followers of Pelagius and Celestius (to whom he ascribes Manichean tenets). The second category (those who have to be confirmed) comprises the Quartodecimans, the Novatians, and the Sabbatians, the Arians, the Macedonians, and the Apollinarianists. In the third category (those whose baptism and confirmation are accepted) he places the Meletians, the Nestorians, the various Monophysite sects, the Messalians and the Euchytes.

On the whole, the new heretics were more leniently dealt with, all their sacraments were accepted,— why, it is sometimes rather difficult to tell, as for instance in the case of the Apollinarianists. It is remarkable that Timothy says nothing of the reordination of those heretics who, according to the letter to Martyrius, were to be reordained. The same omission — in this case undoubtedly intentional — is noticed in the 95th canon of the Quinisext Council (692),[190] which reproduces the reply to Martyrius, but omits the pas-

Schoenfelder, München, 1862), p. 9–17, 83, 84, quoted by Saltet, *op. cit.,* p. 53–55.

[189] *P. G.,* LXXXVI, 1, col. 13 and foll.

[190] Mansi, XI, 984; cf. Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des conciles,* III, 2, p. 574 (*Hist. of the Councils,* vol. V, p. 235).

sages pertaining to the reordination of the Arians, the Macedonians, the Sabbatians, the Novatians, and the Apollinarianists. Hence Greek discipline tended more and more to accept the validity of the orders conferred by heretics. This practice was sanctioned in the first session of the 7th General Council (787). After a patristic inquiry that does not seem to have been altogether impartial, the patriarch Tarasius succeeded in obtaining a decision to the effect that clerics who had returned after being ordained by the Iconoclasts, should be allowed to exercise their respective orders without reordination.[191]

At the time of which we are speaking, the theological teaching in regard to baptism had almost reached its definitive stage and made but little progress. St. Cyril carefully distinguishes the baptism of Jesus from that of St. John, and places the latter half-way between the Jewish ablutions, which it surpassed in dignity, and the Christian baptism, of which it was a preparation (*παιδαγωγικόν*).[192] Pseudo-Dionysius gives a detailed account of the ceremonies of Christian baptism.[193] The reader will notice the importance assigned to the blessing of the water, which is sanctified by "the holy epicleses" (*ταῖς ἱεραῖς ἐπικλήσεσι*).[194] Theodoret had already expressed the same thought more strongly: *τῆς θείας ἐπικλήσεως ἁγιαζούσης τῶν ὑδάτων τὴν φύσιν*.[195] It is the tradition of St. Cyril of Jerusalem which continues to be proclaimed.

As to the effects of baptism, the ecclesiastical writers of

[191] MANSI, XII, 1019–1050.

[192] *In Ioannem*, II (col. 188, 260, 289).

[193] *De eccles. hier.*, II, 2, 1–8 (col. 393–397). They are also described at length in the *Constitutions of the Egyptian Church*, XVI (middle of the 5th century, FUNK, *Didascalia et Constitut. apostolorum*, II, 109 and foll.), and in the *Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ* (edit. RAHMANI, Mainz, 1899).

[194] II, 2, 7, col. 396.

[195] *In psalm.* XXVIII, v. 3 (col. 1065).

that time merely repeat and enlarge upon that same tradition, though they insist more strongly than their predecessors had done on the divine life and grace of which the sacrament is the principle for the neophyte. "Baptism," writes Cyril of Alexandria, "cleanses us of all stains, makes us God's holy temples and partakers of His divine nature through the communication of the Holy Ghost," *τῆς θείας αὐτοῦ φύσεως κοινωνοὺς διὰ μετοχῆς τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος.*[196]

Baptism was, as a rule, immediately followed by confirmation, which consisted in the anointing of the subject with perfumed oil,— a necessary ceremony, Theodoret remarks, since the Novatians, who have discarded it, must submit to it when they come back to the Church.[197] The oil was previously blessed by the bishop, by means of a consecratory prayer (*τελουμένη εὐχή*).[198] Pseudo-Dionysius merely says that the bishop anoints and marks the neophyte with the sign of the cross (*τῷ θεουργικωτάτῳ μύρῳ τὸν ἄνδρα σφραγισάμενος*).[199] The *Constitutions of the Egyptian Church* (XVI, 18–20) embody a more complex rite. The bishop first lays his hands on the candidate, and then anoints his forehead, the anointing being accompanied by another imposition of hands. The formula of unction is: *"Ungo te oleo sancto per Deum patrem omnipotentem et Iesum Christum et Spiritum sanctum."*

The whole ceremony completes the baptismal initiation, perfects the neophyte, and unites him to the Holy Ghost.[200]

[196] *In Lucam*, XXII, v. 8 (col. 904); *Contra Iulian.*, VII (col. 880); *In psalm.* L, v. 12 (col. 1096); Theodoret, *In Isaiam*, XXXII, v. 20 (col. 385); Isid. Pelus., *Epist.* III, 195 (col. 880); St. Nilus, *Epist.* II, 16 (col. 208); Pseudo-Dion., *De eccl. hier.*, II, 3, 1 (col. 397).

[197] *Haeret. fabul. comp.*, III, 5 (col. 408).

[198] Pseudo-Dionysius, *De eccl. hier.*, IV, 2 (col. 473).

[199] *De eccles. hier.*, IV, 2, 7; 3, 8 (col. 396, 404).

[200] Cyril, *In Ioelem*, XXXII (col. 573); Pseudo-Dion., *De eccles. hier.*, IV, 3, 8; IV, 11 (col. 404, 484).

§ 7. The Eucharist.[201]

After being confirmed, the neophyte was admitted to the Eucharist, the third sacrament of Christian initiation.

The Eucharistic teaching of the Greeks at the beginning of the 5th century may be summed up as follows: (1) In the Eucharist we receive really and truly the body and blood of Jesus Christ. (2) That body and blood are there through the efficacy either of the words of institution, or of the epiclesis, or of both. (3) Those words, or the Holy Spirit whom they invoke, produce in the *oblata* a μεταβολή, the mystery of which St. Cyril of Jerusalem and St. Gregory of Nyssa endeavored to explain. (4) The Eucharistic liturgy constitutes a sacrifice. (5) The reception of the Eucharist washes away our sins, unites us to God, and implants in our bodies a germ of life and immortality.

Regarding the first point, the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, the Church's teaching was so clear and well established that the writers from the 5th to the 7th century did not deem it necessary to dwell on it, except when they wished to justify the conclusions they drew from that teaching. As we shall see later, St. Cyril, Nestorius, and Theodoret in their controversies always assume that point as settled; subsequent ascetical writers, preachers, and liturgists do likewise. Two instances may suffice.

Against Timothy, the leader of the Acephali, who asserted that there is but one nature, the divine, in Jesus Christ after the Incarnation, Anastasius Sinaita argued as follows:

"If Jesus Christ is only divinity, it is evident that, since the divinity cannot be seen or touched, since it cannot be immolated, having neither members nor need of food, Timothy,

[201] Cf. P. Batiffol, *L'Eucharistie*, 5th edition, Paris, 1913.

like the Jews, denies the sacrifice and the communion of the holy mysteries; he does not believe, he does not confess in truth that what the offerer gives to the people, saying: *'The body and blood of the Lord and God and our Savior Jesus Christ,'* is the visible, created, and earthly body and blood of Christ. For if he says that the divinity is Christ's only nature, as it does not become the divine nature to be handled or broken or divided or dealt out in parts, or shed and exhausted, or changed or torn by the teeth, Timothy must of necessity fall into one of these two abysses: he must either affirm that the divinity can suffer and change, or deny that body and blood of Christ which he offers and eats at the mystical table, and which he gives to the people, saying: *'The body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.'"* [202]

We see from this text how Anastasius draws an argument against the Monophysites from the reality of the body and blood of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist. The reader will notice particularly the materialistic language which he employs to express his faith in that mystery, and which he seems to borrow from St. John Chrysostom. He goes so far as to attribute to the body of Jesus Christ the modes of being or accidents that belong only to the sacramental species.

Another instance, taken from a discourse of Eutychius, patriarch of Constantinople (552–582), shows how that theologian conceived the presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist. He speaks of the Last Supper as follows:

"Jesus Christ sacrificed Himself mystically, when, after supper, having taken the bread in His own hands, and having given thanks, He showed it and broke it, introducing Himself into the antitype (ἐμμίξας ἑαυτὸν τῷ ἀντιτύπῳ). In like manner

[202] *Hodegos*, XIII (col. 208–209); cf. XXIII, col. 297, where he goes, if possible, still farther, and XIV, col. 248, where he notes a similar argument in Ammonius of Alexandria.

also, having mingled and blessed the cup of the fruit of the vine, He presented it to God the Father and said: *'Take ye, eat ye,'* and *'Take ye, drink ye, this is my body and this is my blood.'* So, then, every one receives whole the holy body and the precious blood of the Lord, although he receives only a portion of the visible elements (τούτων); for [Christ] divides Himself indivisibly among all, having placed Himself [in the elements]."

In order to give some explanation of the mystery, Eutychius adduces two comparisons: that of the seal which multiplies its imprint, losing none of its own being and unity, and that of the voice, which wholly reaches all the hearers, though it is one and remains whole in the speaker; then he continues:

"Let none, therefore, doubt that the body and blood of the Lord, incorruptible after the mystical consecration and the holy resurrection, and immortal and holy and lifegiving, inserted in the antitypes (τοῖς ἀντιτύποις ἐντιθέμενον) by the priests, impresses thereon its own powers, no less than [the seal and the voice] in the aforesaid examples, and is found whole in the whole of them. For in the Lord's body dwells all the fulness of the godhead of the Word and of God, bodily, *i.e.*, substantially." [203]

Eutychius therefore asserts that Jesus Christ exists in the Eucharist unextensively, whole in every part of the elements, at least *in sumptione*. Whilst this view is also realistic, it is manifestly, at least in expression, more spiritual and philosophical than that of Anastasius.[204]

[203] *Sermo de paschate et ss. eucharistia*, 2, 3 (*P. G.*, LXXXVI, 2, 2393, 2396).

[204] Besides the texts to be mentioned later, the reader may also consult, on the subject of the real presence, Theodoret, *Quaest. in Exod.*, Interr. 27 (col. 257); *In Cantic. canticorum*, IV, v. 11 (col. 128); *In*

What words in the liturgy have the power to make Jesus Christ present in the Eucharist? The Greek theologians do not expressly discuss this question.[205] The writers of the 5th, 6th, and 7th centuries ascribe the sanctification of the *oblata* variously to the words of institution, to the epiclesis, to Jesus Christ acting through the priest, to the Holy Ghost, or even to Jesus Christ acting through the Holy Ghost. Theodoret, Isidore of Pelusium, Eutychius, and Narses insist on the epiclesis and the Holy Ghost.[206] Severus of Antioch declares himself for the words of institution.[207] The Eucharistic liturgy preserved in the *Constitutions of the Egyptian Church* recalls the words of institution (I, 19), but subjoins an epiclesis (1, 25).

There was no binding teaching on the subject. The Greek theologians, in treating of the Holy Eucharist, had other ends in view. Their whole attention was centered upon the Christological problem. The contrary solutions given to this problem by Nestorius and St. Cyril, gave rise to contrary views regarding the state of the body and blood of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, and their action upon communicants. It is this particular phase of the subject that principally engaged the early writers when dealing with

epist. ad Ephes., V, v. 29, 30 (col. 548); St. Nilus, *Epist.* I, 44, 99–101; II, 144, 233, etc.; *Constitutiones ecclesiae aegypt.*, I, 25; XXIX; XXX, 1, 2. No doubt Pseudo-Dionysius was a realist, though it is rather difficult to prove this by precise citations from his pretentious and purposely obscure writings. So much is clear — he admits a divine reality existing under the visible symbols (*De eccles. hierarch.*, III, 3, 12, col. 444).

[205] Cf. on this subject F. Varaine, *L'épiclèse eucharistique*, Brignais, 1910, chapt. II and III.

[206] Theodoret, *Eranistes*, II (col. 168, 281); Isid. Pelus., *Epist.* I, 109 (col. 256); Eutychius, *Sermo de paschate*, 8 (col. 2401); Narses, *Homily* XVII (D. B. H. Connolly, *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, Cambridge, 1909, p. 22).

[207] L. W. Brooks, *The Sixth Book of the select Letters of Severus*, II, 237, 238.

the Eucharist, and to it St. Cyril, in particular, devotes many pages of his writings.

The union existing between the Word and the humanity of Jesus Christ, as construed by Nestorius, is altogether too loose. Nestorius overrates the distinction of what he calls *the natures;* and, in order to justify his view, appeals to the words of the promise and institution: *"He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood."* "Jesus Christ," he declares, "did not say: *He who eats my divinity and drinks my divinity, abides in me and I in him.* . . . Whom (τίνα) do we eat? The divinity or the flesh?"[208] And again: "Taking the bread and giving thanks, He gave it to His disciples, saying: *Take ye, eat ye all thereof, for this is my body.* Why did He not say: *This is my divinity broken for you?* Likewise, when giving the chalice of the mysteries, He did not say: *This is my divinity shed for you;* but, *This is my blood shed for you for the remission of sins."*[209]

If, as St. Cyril believed, Nestorius admitted only a moral union between the divinity and the humanity of Jesus Christ while living here below, evidently this union can only exist between the Word on the one hand, and the Eucharistic body and blood on the other, and it would follow, (1) that the Eucharistic body cannot give us life because it is not physically united to Him who is Himself life, and does not possess Him *ad intra* (οἰκοθεν), but is joined to Him from the outside (ἔξοθεν);[210] (2) that communion does not unite us

[208] Loofs, *Nestoriana,* 227, 228; cf. Cyril, *Adv. Nestor.,* IV, 6 (col. 205).

[209] Loofs, *Nestoriana,* 229, 230. Theodoret reasons in the same manner (*Eranistes,* I, col. 56).

[210] Cf. the XIth counter-anathematism of Nestorius: "Si quis unitam carnem Verbo Dei ex naturae propriae possibilitate vivificatricem esse dixerit, ipso domino et deo pronuntiante: *Spiritus est qui vivificat, caro nihil prodest,* anathema sit." Loofs, *Nestoriana,* 216.

physically and immediately to the Word, but only gives us the body to which He is morally united. We are not nourished by God; we merely eat and drink a body and blood sanctified by the Word, but to which He remains in some measure foreign.

Cyril protests against these two corollaries of Nestorius' theory,[211] because, like the whole Nestorian Christology, they jeopardize our redemption and deification in Christ. Hence, in treating of the Incarnation and the Redemption, he insists on his own doctrinal principles and shows to what conclusions these principles lead when applied to the Eucharist, and how contrary they are to those of Nestorius. His texts on the subject are very numerous; we shall analyze but a few.

Explaining the words of institution in his commentary on *Luke,* XXII, 19,[212] Cyril says that "we receive in ourselves the Word of God the Father, made flesh for us, the Word who is life and lifegiving," and goes on to explain this statement as follows: God had made man immortal, but the evil spirit, by dragging him into sin, dragged him to his death. The divine goodness repaired that downfall; but in order that our mortal bodies be restored to immortality, they must share in God's lifegiving power (*τῆς παρὰ Θεοῦ ζωοποιοῦ δυνάμεως γενέσθαι μέτοχον*), for God is life by His very essence. In order to effect this participation, the Father, who is life itself, sends Christ, who is also life (*ζωὴν ὄντα καὶ αὐτόν*), since He is the Word of the Father and His vivifying power (*δύναμις ἡ ζωοποιός*), and becomes incarnate without change and conversion, without ceasing to be the Word. He assumes our flesh, resuscitates it and makes it

[211] Regarding St. Cyril's Eucharistic teaching, cf. J. Mahé, *L'eucharistie d'après saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie,* in *Revue d'hist. ecclés.,* VIII (1907), p. 677 and foll.

[212] *P. G.,* LXXII, 908–912.

incorruptible, nay lifegiving. How lifegiving? Cyril illustrates this by various comparisons. When you throw a crumb into a liquid, he says, it becomes saturated with that liquid and acquires its power; when you throw iron into the fire, it remains iron, though it burns. In like manner, the flesh united to the lifegiving Word, in a way known to God alone, becomes lifegiving. Jesus Christ declares: "I am the living bread come down from heaven, if anyone eats this bread, he shall live forever, and the bread that I shall give is my flesh." "Hence," St. Cyril concludes, "by eating the flesh of Christ, the Savior of us all, and drinking His precious blood, we have life within us, we become, as it were, one with Him, we abide in Him and possess Him within ourselves."

If Christ's body, which we receive in the "mystical eulogy," is lifegiving, because it is the body of the Word, which is closely and physically united to Him,[213] and enters into us by communion, what relation does communion establish between the Word and us? In his commentary on

[213] St. Cyril frequently reverts to this idea, and seems to attribute great importance to it. The flesh of Jesus Christ "having become the flesh of the Life, *i.e.*, of the Word of God and the Father who has manifested Himself, has received the efficacy of life, and it is impossible that life should be conquered by death" (*In Ioannem*, XV, 1, col. 344). "Christ's holy body, then, vivifies those in whom it is found, and, by being joined to our bodies, keeps them in the state of incorruption, for it is not the body of an ordinary man, but of the Life by essence, having in itself all the efficacy of the Word who is united to it, being clothed, as it were, with the same properties, nay being filled with His power of action by which everything is vivified and preserved in existence" (*ibid.*, VI, 35, vol. 520, 521; VI, 56, col. 584; *Adv. Nestor.*, IV, 5 col. 189–197; *Cont. Iulian.*, VIII, col. 896). He gives the finishing touch to this doctrine in his eleventh anathematism, though the Eucharist is there touched upon only indirectly: "Whosoever shall not confess that the flesh of the Lord giveth life and that it pertains to the Word of God the Father as His very own, but shall pretend that it [the flesh] belongs to another person who is united to him only according to honor, and who has served as a dwelling for the divinity;

Luke, XXII, 19, the Patriarch of Alexandria raises the objection: If the Word makes His own flesh lifegiving, because it is united to Him, then must He not also impart a lifegiving efficacy to the body of every one of us, in whom He dwells through communion? No, because the union of the Word with His flesh — that flesh which He made His own — is one thing, and the union which exists between us and the Son, in consequence of His being within us through a mere participation of relation (*κατὰ μέθεξιν σχετικήν*) is another thing.[214] This last expression is vague, and the union thus described, very loose; but St. Cyril explains himself more fully in his commentary on *John,* VI, 57, where he compares the communicant's union with Christ to the union of two lumps of molten wax which become perfectly combined, and to that of the leaven and the dough, the leaven being in the whole dough, and the whole dough in the whole leaven. Thus it is, he adds, that "he who receives the body of Christ our Savior, and drinks His precious blood, becomes, in Christ's own words, one with Him, as it were, mixed with Him and drowned in Him through that participation, so that he abides in Christ and Christ in Him."[215] The same idea is expressed a few pages further on in the same commentary (XV, 1), where Cyril points to man's bodily union with the Savior in communion to explain St. Paul's dictum that the Gentiles have become *concorporal* (*σύσσωμα*) with Christ and that Christ looks upon all the faithful as His members: "For it is proper to observe," he says, "that [by the words: *He that eateth my flesh,*

and [shall not confess], as we say, that that flesh giveth life because it is that of the Word who giveth life to all, let him be anathema" (col. 309, 312); cf. also *Apolog. cont. orientales* (col. 273, 276); *contra Theodoretum* (col. 448).

[214] *Loc. cit.,* col. 909.

[215] *P. G.,* LXXIII, 584. The comparison drawn from the lump of wax is repeated at the end of the following quotation.

etc.] Christ does not assert that He will be with us merely through a certain relation of affection, but by physical participation" (*οὐ κατὰ σχέσιν τινὰ μόνην . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ κατὰ μέθεξιν φυσικήν*). The ultimate reason for the necessity of such a close and, as it were, material union is explained thus: "What is by nature corruptible can be vivified only if it is corporally (*σωματικῶς*) united to the body of Him who is life by essence, *i.e.*, to the body of the only begotten One." [216]

According to St. Cyril, then, man's union with the Word in holy communion holds the middle between the hypostatic union that would make the body vivifying, and a purely moral union that could not vivify it. It is a physical union with the vivifying body of the Word, the prime source of life. Christ's holy body feeds ours *πρὸς ἀναστασίαν καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον*: [217]

"Even though death, which has invaded us in consequence of the fall, has subjected our bodies to the necessity of corruption, yet, since Christ is in us through His own flesh, we shall surely rise. For it were incredible, yea impossible, that life should not vivify those in whom it is. As when one buries a spark amid the stubble in order to keep alive the seed of fire, so our Lord Jesus Christ hides in us life through His own flesh and inserts it as a seed of immortality that will abolish all corruption in us." [218]

The reader will recognize in these texts the leading thoughts, if not the philosophy, of St. Gregory of Nyssa. But Cyril does not confine the action of the Eucharist to the body. Participation in Christ is not only life, it is also

[216] *P. G.*, LXXIV, 341. Cf. *In Ioannem*, XVII, 22, 23 (col. 564); *Adv. Nestor.*, IV, 5 (col. 193); *Glaph. in Genesim*, I: *σύσσωμοι μὲν γὰρ γεγόναμεν αὐτῷ (τῷ Χριστῷ) δι' εὐλογίας τῆς μυστικῆς* (col. 29).

[217] *In Ioann.*, VI, 56 (col. 581); *Glaph. in Exodum*, II (col. 428).

[218] *In Ioann.*, VI, 55 (col. 581). Cf. *De recta fide ad Theodos.*, XXXVIII (col. 1189).

sanctification: ζωὴ γὰρ καὶ ἁγιασμὸς ἡ Χριστοῦ μετοχή;[219] not only does it banish death, but it also heals the diseases of the soul, checks the law of the flesh that is within us, fosters piety towards God, mortifies the passions, repairs what is broken, raises what is fallen, and frees us from the attacks and the tyranny of Satan.[220] Hence the necessity of communicating and the obligation of leading a pure and truly Christian life, so as to be worthy to receive communion.[221]

This teaching of St. Cyril on the vivifying nature of the Savior's Eucharistic body and its effects within us is reproduced, at least in its main points, by the authors who came after him, particularly by those who followed in his wake: St. Isidore of Pelusium,[222] St. Nilus,[223] the Pseudo-Areopagite,[224] and Eutychius.[225] As to Leontius of Byzantium, it is not surprising to find that he draws his inspiration from the Cyrillian texts we have quoted.[226]

The preceding analysis, however, tells us nothing of the way in which St. Cyril conceived the change that takes place in the *oblata* at the consecration. This question does not seem to have attracted his attention. Yet, in a passage, already quoted,[227] of his commentary on *St. Luke,* he briefly touches upon it, though he gives no clear answer. After saying that the manner in which the Word has become united to the flesh in the Incarnation is beyond our understanding, he goes on:

[219] *Glaph. in Exod.,* II (col. 428); *In Lucam,* XXII, 19 (col. 908).
[220] *In Lucam,* IV, v. 38 (col. 552); *In Ioann.,* VI, 57 (col. 585).
[221] *In Ioann.,* VI, 35, 57 (col. 521, 584, 585).
[222] *Epist.* I, 109 (col. 256).
[223] *Epist.* I, 100, 101 (col. 125); III, 39 (col. 405).
[224] *De eccles. hierarch.,* III, 3, 12 (col. 444).
[225] *Sermo de paschate,* 3 (col. 2393).
[226] *Contra nestorianos et eutychianos,* III (*P. G.,* LXXXVI, 1, col. 1385).
[227] *In Lucam,* XXII, 19 (col. 912).

"He [the Word] must needs dwell in us through the Holy Ghost in a manner befitting God; and also be mingled, as it were, with our bodies, through His holy flesh and His precious blood, which we receive as a lifegiving blessing as in bread and wine (ὡς ἐν ἄρτῳ τε καὶ οἴνῳ); for in order that we should not be horrified by seeing flesh and blood set out on the holy table of our churches, God, condescending to our infirmities, sends forth the power of life into the *oblata,* and transfers them into the efficacy of His own flesh (καὶ μεθίστησιν αὐτὰ πρὸς ἐνέργειαν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σαρκός), that through these *oblata* we may have lifegiving participation, and that the body of life may be found in us as a lifegiving seed. Doubt not that this is true, since He clearly says: *This is my body* and *this is my blood;* but rather receive in faith the word of the Savior; for being truth, He does not lie."

It is false to say that the text: "He transfers the *oblata* into the efficacy of His own flesh," foreshadows Calvin's teaching of the virtual presence (*in virtute*) of Christ's body in the Eucharist. No doubt, it is the efficacy of the body, but also the body itself which the consecration places in the *oblata.* St. Cyril does not say that these *oblata* are substantially changed into the body and blood, either here or where he affirms that we receive the body and blood of Jesus Christ ὡς ἐν ἄρτῳ τε καὶ οἴνῳ. He does not push his analysis beyond the threshold of the mystery. For him, the body and blood certainly exist in the bread and wine, but not in their natural mode and shape. The bread and wine are veils designed to overcome our repugnance and weakness. That is all the holy Doctor inculcates, and it sufficed for his purpose.

Did the teachings of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Gregory of Nyssa, and St. John Chrysostom on the change of the *oblata* pass unnoticed in the Greek Church, or were they forgotten as early as 430–440? No; the Monophysites at

least seem to have remembered them, and, somewhat later, Severus of Antioch says that "in the celebration of the Eucharist it is not the minister who, making use of a power as if his own, transforms the bread into the body of Christ, and the cup of blessing into His blood." [228] Philoxenus speaks in the same sense.[229] But the abuse of these teachings on the part of some Eutychians aroused the suspicion, nay, at times, the opposition of perfectly orthodox theologians, as we shall see in connection with Theodoret.

Theodoret's Eucharistic teaching, generally speaking, does not go beyond the surface of the mystery. He has none of St. Cyril's bold intuition. He is a determined realist, and conceives Christ's presence in the Eucharist as enabling the Savior to be "sacrificed unsacrificed, and divided undivided, and expended remaining unspent"; [230] and he ascribes the power of remitting sins to communion, although he demands purity of him who wishes to take to his lips the body of Jesus Christ.[231] Besides this, his *Eranistes* contains some passages of the utmost importance for the history of the concept of conversion and transubstantiation in the Greek Church.[232]

The *Eranistes* (447) was written to refute the Monophysitism of some Eutychians, who maintained that there was in Christ a confusion of two natures, or a conversion of one of the two natures into the other, and consequently, the

[228] E. W. Brooks, *The Sixth Book of the select Letters of Severus*, II, p. 237.

[229] *Tractatus de Trinitate et Incarn.*, p. 93 and foll. However, Philoxenus speaks differently, p. 100.

[230] *In psalm.* LXII, v. 3 (col. 1337).

[231] *In Isaiam*, VI, v. 6 (col. 268); *In epist. I ad Corinth.*, XI, v. 27 (col. 317).

[232] On what follows, cf. J. Lebreton, *Le dogme de la transsubstantiation et la théologie antiochienne du V^e siècle*, in *Etudes*, v. CXVII (1908), p. 477 and foll.

passibility of the divine nature. Against the last-mentioned error, Theodoret recalls the history of the institution of the Holy Eucharist. In giving the Eucharist as "the type of His passion" (*τοῦ πάθους τὸν τύπον*), our Lord did not speak of His divinity, but of His body and blood: "*This is my body; this is my blood.*" Hence it is the body, not the divinity, that was crucified and suffered.[233]

Theodoret again appeals to the Eucharistic mystery to prove that, even after the ascension, there was no change of humanity into divinity. The mystical symbols (*τὰ μυστικὰ σύμβολα*) offered up by the priests, are the symbols of a real body and real blood, for an image must have an archetype and correspond to a reality. There exists, then, in heaven, a real body of Jesus Christ, of which the divine mysteries are the antitypes (*ἀντίτυπα*) and which is distinct from the divinity.[234]

At this juncture the dialogue becomes particularly interesting. The Monophysite who is arguing against the defender of orthodoxy, strives to show from the Eucharist that our Savior's body was transformed into the divinity after the ascension. Before the epiclesis, he says, there is on the altar only bread and wine; after the consecration, the *oblata* are called the body and blood of Jesus Christ, and they are received as such in communion. "As the symbols of the Lord's body and blood, therefore, are one thing before the priestly epiclesis, and are changed and become another thing after the epiclesis (*μεταβάλλεται καὶ ἕτερα γίνεται*), so our Lord's body, after the ascension, is changed into the divine substance" (*εἰς τὴν οὐσίαν μετεβλήθη τὴν θείαν*).[235]

As an argument for the Eutychian thesis, this is very weak indeed; but it proves that the idea of the Eucharis-

[233] Eranistes, III, col. 269, 272.
[234] Eranistes, II, col. 165, 168.
[235] *Ibid.*, col. 168.

tic conversion continued to subsist, at least in Monophysite circles, for it is improbable that Theodoret invented the whole argument. Theodoret, who speaks through the orthodox party in the debate, absolutely rejects the theory of a conversion. He denies the fact to which his opponent appeals. "After the sanctification," he says, "the mystic symbols do not lose their own nature; they remain in their former substance, figure, and form — visible and tangible as they were before. We can only conceive what they have become, and believe it and adore it as though they were what we believe them to be." [236]

Theodoret, then, does not admit that the nature and substance (*φύσις, οὐσία*) of bread and wine undergo a conversion through consecration. But what *is* the effect of consecration? For after all, the orthodox disputant goes on to say, the names are changed; the bread is no longer called bread; it is called body.

Theodoret tries to explain what the consecration produces in the elements in the first dialogue of his *Eranistes*.[237] He affirms that, in matter of fact, bread and wine are called body and blood; but also that Christ called His body "wheat," and that He called Himself "the vine," the wine of which is His blood. Now, he adds, the initiated know what is the purpose of this change of names:

"Christ wished the partakers in the divine mysteries not to attach themselves to the nature of the visible objects, but, considering the change in names, to believe the change (conversion) wrought by grace (*πιστεύειν τῇ ἐκ τῆς χάριτος γεγενημένῃ μεταβολῇ*). For He who spoke of His natural body as wheat and bread, and called Himself a vine, dignified the visible symbols by the

[236] *Οὐδὲ γὰρ μετὰ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν τὰ μυστικὰ σύμβολα τῆς οἰκείας ἐξίσταται φύσεως· μένει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας οὐσίας, καὶ τοῦ σχήματος, καὶ τοῦ εἴδους, καὶ ὁρατά ἐστι, καὶ ἁπτὰ, οἷα καὶ πρότερον ἦν κτλ.*

[237] Col. 53, 56.

name of *body* and *blood,* not because He had changed their nature, but because to their nature He had added grace."

Consecration, then, produces a μεταβολή. But this μεταβολή is not the change or conversion of the substance of the bread into the body of Jesus Christ; that substance acquires merely a grace, a dignity that accrues to it from its union with the Savior's body produced and present; — a union which justifies the current and well-known interchange of appellations that are used to designate the body and the bread. Theodoret does not insist that the body of Jesus Christ is produced in the consecration; this point was already settled; but he asserts that that production does not result from a conversion of the *oblata,* and suggests that the *oblata* hold a similar relation to the body of Jesus Christ as the humanity of Christ does to His divinity. There flows into the *oblata* from that body a virtue or grace which sanctifies them without either changing or destroying their nature.

This is a genuine Eucharistic Dyophysitism. The same theory is found in an (apocryphal) letter of St. John Chrysostom, written after the Council of Chalcedon, to the monk Cæsarius.[238] Like Eranistes, Cæsarius was a Monophysite who, in order to justify his error, appealed to the mystery of the Eucharist: "Do we not receive faithfully and piously God's body and blood? Most certainly; not that the divine possessed flesh and blood by nature before the Incarnation, but we say that it possesses them, because it appropriates (ἰδιοποιεῖται) what belongs to the flesh."[239] This reasoning is correct; but the writer who, to say the least, leans toward Nestorianism and rejects the *communicatio idiomatum,* does not accept the expression "God's body and blood," and whilst granting that the bread is called

[238] *P. G.,* LII, 755–760.
[239] Col. 759.

body, denies that the former is substantially converted into the latter in the consecration. He admits that, after the consecration, there is but "one body of the Son," but in the same manner as there is but one Son and one person in Christ after the Incarnation, even though the two natures continue to exist. The text is as follows:

"Sicut enim antequam sanctificetur panis, panem nominamus: divina autem illum sanctificante gratia, mediante sacerdote, liberatus est quidem ab appellatione panis; dignus autem habitus dominici corporis appellatione, etiamsi natura panis in ipso permansit, et non duo corpora, sed unum corpus Filii praedicamus: sic et hic divina ἐνιδρυσάσης, id est insidente corpori natura, unum Filium, unam personam utraque haec fecerunt." [240]

Thus it was that fear of Monophysitism, and the abuse made by the Eutychians of the argument recorded in the *Eranistes,* checked the development of the doctrine of conversion in the East. We shall find it again in St. John Damascene, but the Saint does not illustrate it by any commentary; he simply asserts it.

As to the sacrificial character of the Eucharist, even though it is often affirmed in the period with which we are dealing, yet the theory, properly so called, of the Eucharistic sacrifice hardly makes any progress. Theodoret observes that the Savior at the Last Supper inaugurated the exercise of His priesthood, which, as man, He continues to exercise through the ministry of the Church, while as

[240] Col. 758. C. Gore (*Dissertations on Subjects connected with the Incarnation,* London, 1895, p. 275, 276) quotes Ephrem, patriarch of Antioch (526–545), as one of those in the East who held Theodoret's view; but the text which he gives, taken from Photius (*Biblioth.,* cod. 229, *P. G.,* CIII, 980), hardly seems conclusive.

God, He receives the offering of the sacrifice.[241] There is, then, in the Church "a divine and unbloody sacrifice" (*θεία καὶ ἀναίμακτος θυσία*),[242] the chief priest of which is Jesus Christ, and the victim, the only immaculate lamb that takes away the sins of the world.[243] In it there is represented by the breaking of bread the Savior's death; Jesus Christ is mystically offered up: He dies spiritually;[244] for the priests do not offer a sacrifice different from that of the cross, but they celebrate the memory of that unique and saving sacrifice.[245] The strongest words on this subject (words that recall an expression of St. Gregory of Nazianzus), are these by Nestorius: "Christ is crucified in figure, being slain by the sword of the priestly invocation," *σταυροῦται μὲν κατὰ τὸν τύπον Χριστός, τῇ τῆς ἱερατικῆς εὐχῆς μαχαίρᾳ σφαττόμενος.*[246] Besides the descriptions given by the *Constitutions of the Egyptian Church* and by Pseudo-Dionysius,[247] there are still extant many documents that refer to the Eucharistic liturgy, since many liturgies were then composed and circulated under the name of some Apostle or illustrious doctor, and although their text has been tampered with in the course of ages, it gives a fairly accurate idea of the beliefs and customs then in vogue.[248]

[241] *In psalm.* CIX, v. 4 (col. 1772, 1773); cf. Eutychius, *Sermo de paschate,* 2, 4, col. 2393, 2397.

[242] St. Nilus, *Epist.* II, 294 (col. 345–348).

[243] Theodoret, *In Malachiam,* I, v. 11 (col. 1968); Cyril, *In Lucam,* II, 8 (col. 489).

[244] Eutychius, *Sermo de paschate,* 2, 3 (col. 2393, 2396); cf. *Adv. nestorianos,* V, 22 (*P. G.,* LXXXVI, 1, col. 1744).

[245] Theodoret, *In epist. ad Hebr.,* VIII, v. 4, 5 (col. 736).

[246] Loofs, *Nestoriana,* p. 241.

[247] *Constitut.,* I, 9–34; Pseudo-Dion., *De eccles. hier.,* III, 2 (col. 425 and foll.).

[248] Cf. C. A. Swainson, *Greek Liturgies,* Cambridge, 1884; F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western,* I, Oxford, 1898.

§ 8. Penance.[249]

The penitential discipline also must have given rise to various writings; but it is rather difficult to distinguish them with anything like certainty in the fuller collections into which they have been embodied. This much is certain: from the 5th to the 8th and 9th centuries, the penitential discipline underwent a certain number of modifications and, as a result, canonical penance, as it had been originally practiced, gradually took the present simpler form.

The principle that must be borne in mind as a starting-point, and that governs the whole question, is that the Church, or at least the bishop in the Church, has received from Jesus Christ the power of forgiving sins. We find this principle asserted by St. Cyril of Alexandria,[250] Theodoret,[251] Isidore of Pelusium[252] and Anastasius Sinaita.[253] Anastasius remarks that, whilst, properly speaking, it is God alone who blots out sin, and men merely prompt, exhort and prepare the penitent for the grace of forgiveness, yet man receives the confession and God converts, instructs and forgives through him (δι' αὐτοῦ); the ministers are His συνεργοί.

Who are the ministers of penance and divine forgiveness? During the first four centuries, with a few local exceptions, these ministers were almost exclusively the bishops.[254]

[249] Studies: K. Holl, *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim griechischen Mönchtum*, Leipzig, 1898. H. Koch, *Zur Geschichte der Bussdisziplin und Bussgewalt in der orient. Kirche*, in *Histor. Jahrbuch*, 1900. P. A. Kirsch, *Zur Geschichte der katholischen Beichte*, Würzburg, 1902. P. Batiffol, *Etudes d'histoire et de théol. positive*, 1st series, 3d edit., Paris, 1904. E. Vacandard, artic. *Confession* in the *Dict. de théol. catholique*. G. Rauschen, *Eucharist and Penance*, St. Louis, Mo., 1913.

[250] *In Lucam*, V, 24; VII, 28 (col. 568, 569, 620).

[251] *Quaest. in Levitic.*, Interr. 15 (col. 320).

[252] *Epist.* I, 338 (col. 377).

[253] *Quaestiones*, quaest. VI (col. 373).

[254] However, we must not forget the establishment, at Constantinople,

They had the right — and the duty — to hear the penitents' confession, prescribe to them the works necessary for expiation, and reconcile them to God and the Church. However, in his *Regulae brevius tractatae,*[255] St. Basil evidently supposes that, in monasteries, the monks confess to one of their number, to one of those "to whom the dispensing of the mysteries of God has been entrusted," [256] and who surely were not bishops. This practice became more and more common in the following centuries, and we see, from the 52d cannon of the Apostles and later documents, that, during the 5th century and afterwards, ordinary priests as well as bishops were allowed to reconcile penitents. Nay, during the 8th century, there crept in an abuse which, passing into the world at large from the cloisters where it had probably arisen, tended to take away from the official hierarchy, and even from the priests, the power to absolve, and called forth a very strong resistance on their part. St. Basil and many ascetical writers after him, whilst admonishing the faithful to address themselves to priests for confession,[257] insisted on wisdom, prudence, and discretion as necessary qualities of a confessor. A confessor, they said, should be a man of God, an "excellent judge" and a "spiritual man" [258] (πνευματικὸς ἀνήρ). Hence the name given to confessors of *spiritual fathers* (πνευματικοὶ πατέρες), which is still in use. Now, quite naturally, there soon arose the idea

and in the churches of Thrace, of priests *pacnitentiarii,* whose function it was to receive the confession of sins and watch over the expiatory exercises of penitents (cf. *History of Dogmas,* vol. II, p. 186).

[255] Interrog. 229 and 288.

[256] That these were monks not invested with the priesthood, seems to me improbable.

[257] Anastasius Sin., *Oratio de synaxi* (col. 833); cf. Pseudo-Dion., *Epist.* VIII, 1.

[258] St. John Climacus, *Scala paradisi,* grad. IV (col. 681); Anastasius Sin., *Quaestiones,* qu. VI (col. 369, 372).

that those who were first entitled to claim the quality of πνευματικοί, were the monks. Secular priests, who were mostly married, could not be compared to them in this regard. This idea brought about two consequences:

First, from the time the monks began to go out of their monasteries to mingle with the world, *i. e.,* mainly from the time of the Iconoclast controversies (8th century),[259] they gradually monopolized the ministry of hearing confessions and took it away from the secular clergy. In the *Sermo ad Paenitentes,* ascribed to John the Faster, patriarch of Constantinople (582–595), but which is probably the work of some monk of the 11th century, it is asserted very plainly that, whilst Jesus Christ established bishops, priests, and doctors for the instruction of the faithful, He appointed the monks to hear confession and exhort penitent sinners.[260]

Another, still more serious consequence was that *spirituality* assumed such importance among the qualities required of the confessor that it was forgotten at times, first in cloisters and then in the world at large, that a confessor must first be a priest and have the power to absolve by ordination.

[259] This is the time assigned by John, patriarch of Antioch, in the 12th century. According to him, it was at the time of the Iconoclast disputes, and under the rule of Constantine Kopronymos that, moved by their veneration for the monks, the faithful attributed to them the power of hearing confessions and reconciling or censuring sinners (*De monasteriis laicis non tradendis, 7, P. G.,* CXXXII, 1128).

[260] *P. G.,* LXXXVIII, 1920. A curious letter (the 8th) of Pseudo-Dionysius, addressed to the monk Demophilus, perhaps describes one of the earliest attempts on the part of the Greek monks to meddle in this fashion with the administration of penance. A penitent comes to a priest, who receives him with kindness and gives him absolution. Demophilus appears with his monks and drives the priest and the repentant sinner from church, under the pretext that both have violated the sanctity of the holy place, the sinner being unworthy of forgiveness. Dionysius vehemently rebukes Demophilus and admonishes him to be more respectful towards priests, who are his superiors, and more merciful towards sinners.

Mere monks who had never been ordained heard confession and reconciled penitents, especially from the 10th to the 12th century, and, in the 11th, theologians and canonists were found who were ready to justify that abuse. In their eyes, the power of forgiving sins was a charism granted to sanctity rather than a regular power vested in the official priesthood.[261]

What acts constituted the *cursus* of penance?

The first was the avowal of the sins committed. "Without confession no one obtains forgiveness of his sins,"[262] says St. John Climacus, and mentions in detail the qualities of a good confession: sincerity, humility, and repentance must manifest themselves even in the outward behavior of the penitent.[263] *De jure,* confession was always secret, as may be gathered from the writings of Isidore of Pelusium, St. John Climacus, and Anastasius Sinaita.[264] Had confession been public, the choice of a confessor would have mattered little. In monasteries, however, and whenever the confessor thought it expedient, the secret confession was at times followed by an avowal of guilt — the monastic *culpa* — made publicly. "First of all," writes St. John Climacus, "let us confess our sins to an excellent judge, and to him only: but also to all, if he so commands;" and to justify his advice, he goes on to relate the story of a thief who wanted to become a monk and on whom public confession was imposed.[265]

[261] As these facts and theories do not belong to the period with which we are concerned, we shall not enter into details. Cf. the writings above mentioned of E. Vacandard and K. Holl.

[262] *Scala paradisi,* grad. IV (col. 684).

[263] *Ibid.,* col. 708, 709.

[264] Isid. Pelus., *Epist.* V, 261 (col. 1488); St. John Clim., *Scala,* grad. IV (col. 681); Anastas., *Oratio de synaxi,* col. 833.

[265] *Scala,* grad. IV, col. 681 and foll. Among the Audians, according to Theodoret, confession seems always to have been public. The

Thus understood, confession extended not only to the faults that were known and had been publicly acknowledged, but also to secret sins.[266] This was an ancient practice. What the ecclesiastical writers of the time of which we are speaking endeavored to state more precisely, were the categories of the faults which we now call *mortal,* and which were the subject-matter of confession. As we have seen, St. Gregory of Nyssa had tried to draw up a list of those faults.[267] At the same epoch, Evagrius Ponticus attempted, not to draw up a list of mortal sins, but to reduce to a few fundamental types (*capital sins*) the various kinds of faults that can be committed. He counts eight such capital sins: gluttony, fornication, greed, sadness, anger, weariness, vainglory, and pride.[268] St. John Climacus reduces them to seven, on the ground that, at bottom, vainglory and pride are identical.[269] But these classifications were altogether too theoretical and therefore of little help to confessors, who probably preferred more detailed lists along the lines of the one drawn up by St. Gregory of Nyssa. We have a very complete specimen of such a list in the sermon already mentioned and wrongly ascribed to John the Faster.[270]

penitent had to pass between the holy books (canonical and apocryphal); he confessed his sins, and his sins were remitted without previous penance. Theodoret adds that pseudo-penitents looked upon that ceremony as a farce; they would hide their sins and accuse themselves of mere trifles that provoked laughter (*Haeret. fabul. compend.,* IV, 10, col. 429).

[266] Isid. Pelus., *Epist.* V, 261. See in Chabot (*Synodicon orientale,* p. 433) the VIth canon of the patriarch Isoyahb (582–595), mentioned by J. Labourt, *Le christianisme dans l'emp. perse,* p. 340 and foll.

[267] *Epistula Canonica* (*P. G.,* XLV, 221 and foll.).

[268] *De octo vitiosis cogitationibus,* 1–9 (*P. G.,* XL, 1271).

[269] *Scala,* grad. XXII (col. 948–949).

[270] *P. G.,* LXXXVIII, 1921 and foll. Cf. the penitential of the same author, *ibid.,* 1893 and foll. Cf. also the *Ordo paenitentiae* ascribed to John Mandakuni, catholicos of the Greek-speaking parts of Greater Armenia (+ about 498), and drawn from an Armenian MS. dating from

The second act of penance was the performance of the expiatory works enjoined by the confessor. Formerly, the publicity of penance consisted mainly in the publicity of those expiatory works. But mitigations were gradually introduced. First, in some cases, the penitent was absolved even before he had accomplished the expiation. The penitent referred to by Dionysius Areopagita, in his 8th letter, seems to have been reconciled by the priest immediately after his confession.[271] St. John Climacus says that the Church denies the Eucharist to fornicators for a while, even after receiving them (εἰσδεχομένη);[272] and St. Nilus in an important letter,[273] taunts the priest Chariclis for not being satisfied, at least on some occasions, with expressions of regret by the penitent in the act of confession itself, and for demanding of him difficult and prolonged works of penance.

Then — and this is another mitigation — the penal works imposed by the confessor tended to become less severe, and to remain secret. A perusal of the writers of that epoch makes it plain that, as faith declined in vigor, and Christian life in austerity among the decadent Greeks, they dislike penance and the sacrifices which it demands. Hence these writers entreat confessors to show kindness, mercy,

about the 12th century (*Rituale Armenorum,* edited by F. C. Conybeare, Oxford, 1905, p. 294): "The priest sits down and has the penitent kneel before making his confession; and he mentions to him the various sins by name, and the one who confesses must answer *yes* or *no,* as the case may be." The reader will notice that, at least in theory, the three sins *ad mortem* are still the object of special attention, although the severe attitude of the primitive Church regarding the sins of unchastity is not looked upon as justified (St. John Climacus, *Scala,* grad. XV, col. 889; cf. Anastasius Sin., *Quaestiones,* qu. LXXXV, col. 712).

[271] *Epist.* VIII, 1, col. 1088.

[272] *Scala,* grad. XV, col. 889.

[273] *Epist.* III, 243, col. 496 and foll.

and leniency towards sinners. This idea is plainly brought out in the two letters just referred to, of Pseudo-Dionysius and St. Nilus, and in the *Liber ad pastorem* of St. John Climacus (XIII).[274] The latter remarks, moreover, that God has never revealed the sins heard in confession, lest sinners be turned away from the exomologesis; which is, of course, merely a discreet way of entreating confessors to reveal neither directly nor indirectly — *i. e.,* by imposing a public penance — the secret faults of their penitents.[275]

Public penance was not, however, altogether done away with. As we learn from St. John Climacus, fornicators are still deprived of communion for a time after they had confessed, as is required by the Apostolic canons,[276] and the ancient penitential canons are found reproduced in the new collections of John of Antioch, called the Scholastic (about 550), and in the *Nomocanon* published under Heraclius (610–641).[277] Moreover, both public and secret works of expiation remain substantially as formerly; they consist in fasting, watching, lying on the bare ground, wearing sackcloth and ashes, and giving alms.[278] Among penitent monks, those penances at times assumed almost fantastic shapes and proportions.[279]

The third act of penance was the reconciliation of the guilty. St. Nilus says: "God grants the reward of justice

[274] *P. G.,* LXXXVIII, col. 1196.

[275] *Ibid.* Isidore of Pelusium remarks that those comparatively grievous sins which are secret ought to be punished with less severity than less grievous faults that give scandal.

[276] *Scala,* grad. XV (col. 889); cf. Theodoret, *Epist.* LXXVII, col. 1249; Pseudo-dion., *De eccl. hier.,* III, 2 and 3, 7 (col. 436, 452).

[277] Cf. Pitra, *Iuris ecclesiastici graecorum historia et monumenta,* I, 105–107; II, 336–442; cf. Funk, *Didascalia et Constitut. apostol.,* II, p. 154–157.

[278] St. Nilus, *Epist.* III, 243; St. Gregory of Girgenti (6th–7th century), *In Ecclesiasten,* VI, 4–5 (*P. G.,* XCVIII, 989).

[279] St. John Climacus, *Scala,* grad. V, col. 764 and foll.

to the man who punishes himself through confession." [280] Till about the end of the 4th century, as we have seen, official penance — confession, expiation and forgiveness — was granted only once after baptism. And one of the charges brought against St. John Chrysostom at the Oak synod was that he had invited sinners to have recourse to him as often as they wished.[281] St. Basil, in his *Regulae brevius tractatae*,[282] evidently implies that monks go to confession at least now and then, and St. John Climacus observes that the soul engrossed with the thought of confession is held back, as it were, on the steep road of sin.[283] The custom of confessing more or less frequently, though repeatedly during life, was at the beginning peculiar to monasteries. Later on when they became the confessors of seculars, the monks introduced the custom among the people. This occurred in the 8th century. As early as the 7th century, Anastasius Sinaita extolled confession in general terms as a means of spiritual cure, which can be used repeatedly,[284] and advised sinners to have recourse to it as a desirable preparation for communion.[285] There is no indication, however, at least in the orthodox Church, that it was at that time made obligatory, even for the Easter communion.

§ 9. Extreme Unction. Holy Orders. Matrimony.

Our readers know how few and vague are the traces in ancient Greek theology of the sacrament of Extreme Unction. In the period with which we are concerned, the *Constitutions of the Egyptian Church* (I, 22, 23) contain a

[280] St. Nilus, *Epist.* IV, 7, col. 553.
[281] Mansi, *Concil.*, III, 1145; Socrates, *Hist. eccles.*, VI, 21.
[282] Interrog. 229, 288.
[283] *Scala*, grad. IV, col. 705; cf. 684.
[284] *Quaestiones*, qu. VI (col. 369 and foll.); *Qu. extra ordinem* (col. 760).
[285] *Oratio de synaxi*, col. 832, 833.

formula of blessing oil, which implies that the oil was used not only as food but also as an ointment for the sick [286] (*tribue* [*sanitatem*] *illis qui unguntur et accipiunt*). While deterring the faithful from magical incantations, St. Cyril quotes *James*, V, 14, 15, to show them what they should do in case of sickness.[287] A Syrian writer, Isaac of Antioch (+ about 460), advises Christians not to prepare the oil for anointing the sick themselves, but to take it to church, and, wherever there is a priest, to observe the established order.[288] Lastly, the author of the life of St. Eutychius, Eustrates, who wrote a short while after the Patriarch's demise (582), relates that the Saint was accustomed to anoint the infirm who came to him with oil according to St. James' advice.[289] However, whilst we recognize in all this the substance of the rite of anointing the sick, there is no indication of the idea of a *last* unction, which we now associate with the sacrament.[290]

As has already been remarked, Pseudo-Dionysius sees in the ecclesiastical hierarchy mainly a power for sanctification. Like the angelic hierarchy, the ecclesiastical hierarchy is an intermediary between God and man, destined to bring man nearer to God. It includes three degrees: the first or lowest (deaconship), which has for its object to purify men (καθαρτική); the second, designed to enlighten them (φωτα-

[286] Funk, *Didasc. et Const. apostol.*, II, 100, 101.

[287] *De adoratione in Spiritu et Veritate*, VI (col. 472).

[288] G. Bickell, *S. Isaaci Antiocheni . . . opera omnia*, pars I, Giessen, 1873, pp. 187 and foll. See also the testimony of John Mandakuni (+ about 498), in M. Schmid, *Geistliche Reden des Johannes Mandakuni*, Regensburg, 1871, p. 222 and foll.

[289] *S. Eutychii vita*, VI, 45 (*P. G.*, LXXXVI, 2, col. 2325 and foll.).

[290] Cf. however, *S. Theodori Studitae vita*, 67 (*P. G.*, XCIX, 325). — As to the anointing spoken of by Pseudo-Dionysius (*De eccl. hier.*, VII, 3, 8), it was performed on the corpse of the deceased during the funeral ceremony.

γωγικὴ τάξις) (the priesthood); and the third or highest, which aims at perfecting Christians and uniting them to God (τελειωτική) (the episcopate).[291] From this viewpoint, Dionysius explains the functions of the various orders, and describes the ceremonies by which they are conferred.[292] The rite of imposition of the hand (χειροτονία) is common to all; in the ordination to the episcopate, that rite is accompanied by the imposition of the open book of the Scriptures on the head of the ordinand. This last ceremony, though used at Alexandria about the end of the 5th century, is not mentioned in the *Constitutions of the Egyptian Church,* though these Constitutions give the text of the prayers that accompanied the imposition of the hand.[293] Subdeacons do not receive the imposition of the hand; they are called merely to follow the deacons; lectors do not receive it either: the bishop ordains them by saying a prayer and handing to them the book of the Epistles.[294] Moreover, the *Constitutions* note that, in case a Christian confessed the faith when in prison, he would not have to receive the imposition of the hand to become a deacon or priest: "namque dignitatem presbyteratus confessione sua habet." That ceremony would be required only if he were to be made a bishop.[295] As to the *cantores,* whom we still find in the Greek hierarchy, Justinian's legislation treats them as clerics;[296] but they soon lost that title.[297]

[291] *De eccl. hier.,* V, 1, 5, 6 (col. 505, 508). Cf. St. John Climacus, *Scala,* grad. IV, scholion 82 (col. 757); Antiochus the monk, *Homilia* CXXII (*P. G.,* LXXXIX, 1816, 1817).

[292] *De eccl. hier.,* V, 2.

[293] I, 4–7; II; III. Theodoret observes that the χειροτονία confers grace (*Quaest. in Numer.,* Interr. 47, col. 397). Cf. Isid. Pelus., *Epist.* I, 300.

[294] *Constit. eccl. aegypt.,* V, VI.

[295] *Constit. eccl. aegypt.,* IV. Cf. *Canones Hippolyti,* 43–47, ed. Achelis.

[296] *Novella* CXXIII, 19 (*P. L.,* LXXII, 1030).

[297] The disciplinary ordinances concerning the choice of clerics, the

In regard to matrimonial legislation we must seek for details in the canons of councils and imperial law codices rather than in the writings of theologians. Marriage was regarded as an act sanctified by Christ at the wedding feast of Cana,[298] and which, therefore, religion must also sanctify in its turn, even though civil legislation assert the validity of a union entered into without the intervention of the Church. Theodoret's view on the lawfulness of divorce *propter adulterium* is not plain.[299] St. Isidore of Pelusium seems to assert a husband's right to reject (ἐκβάλειν) an adulterous wife.[300] A *novella* of Justinian, the CXVIIth, which dates from the year 542, is still more liberal and enumerates five reasons that justify a man in divorcing his wife: — if she fails to reveal a conspiracy against the life of the emperor; if she is convicted of adultery; if she conspires against the life of her husband or does not manifest to him a conspiracy of which she has knowledge; if she frequents banquets and baths with other men; lastly, if she

conditions of their ordination, their life and duties, the many functions which they discharged, especially in large cities, the rules that governed their private and public conduct, the ecclesiastical divisions of patriarchates and metropolitan sees, etc., all pertain to Canon Law, and therefore are beyond our province. The reader will find them well treated by J. Pargoire, in *L'Eglise byzantine de 527 à 847*, Paris, 1905, pp. 48–66, 203–210. We merely observe that the Greek discipline as to ecclesiastical celibacy was then what it has remained ever since. Bishops alone were bound to keep it, and only those could become bishops who either were not married, or, having been married but once to a woman who had not been married before, had become widowers. Priests, deacons, and subdeacons were permitted to retain their wives if they had married before their ordination, but, once ordained, they were no longer allowed to marry, or to remarry if they became widowers. Lectors were permitted to marry and remarry even after ordination; however, if twice married, they could not be promoted to a higher order.

[298] Cyril, *In Ioannem*, II, 11–13 (col. 228).

[299] *In Malachiam*, II, v. 15, 16 (col. 1973 and foll.).

[300] *Epist.* IV, 129.

does not live in the family home.[301] However, the same *novella* refuses to sanction divorce because of diabolical possession on the part of the wife or by mutual consent. The last-mentioned rule was reëstablished by Justin II in 566.

Although remarriage after the death of the first partner was allowed,[302] it continued to be frowned upon in the Byzantine world, as may be inferred from the renewal of certain canons of Laodicea and Neocæsarea on the subject. Moreover, the impediments that annul matrimony become more numerous. No one was allowed to marry a heretic;[303] but, if of two heretics who were married one embraced the true faith, he or she was not to leave the other partner.[304] A godfather was not permitted to marry the widowed mother of his godchild.[305] A father and a son were not allowed to marry a mother and her daughter, nor two sisters, nor a mother and daughter two brothers, nor two brothers two sisters.[306] A father-in-law was forbidden to marry his daughter-in-law;[307] a brother-in-law his sister-in-law;[308] no one was allowed to marry the betrothed of another during the other's lifetime.[309] If a girl was taken by force, the ravisher, before marrying her, had to restore her to her parents.[310] A daughter or a slave could not marry without the consent of her father or master.[311] All these

[301] Divorce could also be obtained if one party entered a monastery or if the marriage was not consummated for three years.

[302] Theodoret, *Quaest. in Levitic.*, I–V (col. 301); *In epist. I ad Corinth.*, VII, v. 40 (col. 285).

[303] *Council of Laodicea*, can. 10, 31; *Quinisext Council*, can. 72.

[304] *Quinisext Council*, can. 72.

[305] *Quinisext Council*, can. 53.

[306] *Ib.*, can. 54.

[307] St. Basil, *Epist.* CCXVII, can. 76.

[308] *Ib.*, can. 78.

[309] *Quinisext Council*, can. 98.

[310] St. Basil, *Epist.* CXCIX, can. 22.

[311] *Ib.*, can. 38, 40, 42.

regulations, which were partly ancient canons renewed, partly altogether new laws, show that the marriage legislation of the Church became more extensive and more complex, no doubt in proportion as the customs of the people grew less refined.

§ 10. Honors Paid to the Saints, and Secondary Devotions.

As has been already noticed, there grew up during the preceding century, around the essentials of dogma and worship, a series of beliefs and practices that were a more or less direct outgrowth from dogma and worship. These developments in the Greek Church attain their zenith in the period that extends from the 5th to the 8th century. We shall speak of them only in as far as they are interesting from the viewpoint of dogma.[312]

The veneration of Mary was not, indeed, unknown in the 4th century, but the definition of the Council of Ephesus (431) contributed much to its extension, by making the divine maternity the password, as it were, of the Christological faith against the Nestorians. The magnificent apostrophes addressed to the Mother of God by St. Cyril in his 4th homily, in which he rejoices at the decision of the Council, *χαίροις παρ' ἡμῶν, Μαρία θεοτόκε . . .*,[313] were repeated by many eloquent speakers and writers till the time of Michael Cærularius, nay, far beyond. The absolute virginity of the *ἀειπαρθένος* became an undisputed dogma. All the Greek theologians of that period — who, it must be said, do not attach as much importance nor pay as much attention to the question of original sin as their Latin brethren — whilst they do not affirm positively that Mary's sanctity extends even to freedom from the sin of heredity, regard

[312] Cf. on this subject J. Pargoire, *L'Eglise byzantine de* 527 *à* 847.
[313] *P. G.*, LXXVII, col. 992.

her sanctity as absolutely perfect and complete, and as great as can be found in a creature. The παναγία Virgin is without stain.[314] She is exalted above the Apostles and the angels; she is the mediatrix between heaven and earth: through her all blessings have come to us in Jesus Christ.[315] Hence churches are everywhere built in her honor and under her name,[316] and her feasts multiply. That of the "Hypapante" (which, however, was exclusively devoted to honor the presentation of Jesus in the temple) had been kept since the close of the 4th century. The Quinisext Council (692), in its 52d canon, mentions the feast of the Annunciation (ὁ εὐαγγελισμός), on March 25, as a recognized institution.[317] The feast of the Presentation (ἡ ἐν τῷ ναῷ εἴσοδος) was probably first celebrated at Jerusalem, in November 543. The solemn translation of a garment of the Blessed Virgin to the Blachernæ gave rise (about the year 457–478) to the feast of July 2.[318] That of the Nativity (September 8) was known in the 7th century.[319] Lastly, we must mention the feast of the *Dormitio* (ἡ κοίμησις), transferred by the Emperor Maurice (582–602) from January 18 to August 15. That the earth no longer holds the body of the Blessed Virgin, was the firm belief of the Greeks since the 5th century: the κοίμησις was also a σύσσωμος μετάστασις.[320] The feast of the Conception (December 9, in the Greek Church),

[314] Cf. for instance Basil of Seleucia, *Orat.* XXXIX, 6 (col. 448 and foll.).

[315] *Ibid.*, 5 (col. 441 and foll.).

[316] For instance, that of the Blachernæ at Constantinople.

[317] There is still extant a discourse of Basil of Seleucia on that mystery (*Orat.* XXXIX); but whether it was delivered on the feast of the Annunciation, strictly so called, is uncertain.

[318] N. Nilles, *Kalendarium manuale utriusque ecclesiae*, edit. 2ª, Œniponte, 1896, 1897, I, p. 200, 201.

[319] *Ibid.*, p. 272.

[320] Cf. the various recensions of the apocryphal work *Transitus Mariae* in the *Dict. of Christ. Biogr.*, II, 706.

ἡ σύλληψις τῆς ἁγίας καὶ θεοπρομήτορος Ἄννης, probably dates back to the end of the 7th century, since we have a hymn composed by Andrew of Crete for that feast.[321]

The veneration of the angels and saints grew side by side with that of the Blessed Virgin; but, as St. Cyril observes, it must not be identified with the adoration which we pay to God: "We do not say that the holy martyrs are gods, nor do we adore them as such (λατρευτικῶς); but we venerate them with affection and honor" (σχετικῶς καὶ τιμητικῶς).[322] A *mikhaelion, i.e.,* a chapel dedicated to St. Michael, had been built by Constantine on the Bosphorus, and, following the Emperor's example, Christians erected such sanctuaries everywhere. Theodoret's protest, recalling the prohibition of the Council of Laodicea, remained unheeded.[323] Every faithful Catholic venerated and prayed to his guardian angel.[324] The Apostles, patriarchs, and martyrs likewise had their feastdays. This was a longstanding custom; what was new was the frequency of feasts in honor of mere confessors, the homologetae, as they were called;[325] however, excepting a few instances, this veneration remained exclusively local.

Not only the saints, but also their relics were venerated;[326] they were deemed to sanctify those who came in contact with them.[327] Constantinople possessed many relics of inestimable value. The custom arose of opening no church without depositing therein several relics; and hence "translations" became of daily occurrence. The images of

[321] *P. G.,* XCVII, 1305 and foll.
[322] *Cont. Iulianum,* VI, col. 812.
[323] *In epist. ad Coloss.,* II, v. 18 (col. 613).
[324] St. Dorotheus, *Doctrina,* XXIV (*P. G.,* LXXXVIII, 1837).
[325] St. Dorotheus (about the year 550) calls these feasts *feasts of the Fathers* (ἑορθὴ πατέρων, *Doctrina,* XXIII, 1, col. 1829).
[326] Isid. Pelus., *Epist.* I, 55; II, 5.
[327] Theodoret, *In psalm.* LXVII, v. 11 (col. 1381).

the saints were also honored; we shall soon tell of the terrible opposition that was made to them.[328] Besides, we may notice the very ancient custom of pilgrimages, mainly to Jerusalem, but also Sinai and to the cities made illustrious by the memory of the saints who had lived there.

To these practices in honor of the saints was naturally added the use of those numerous means of cleansing and sanctification that we call sacramentals (*sacramentalia*). Water was solemnly blessed on the day of Epiphany,[329] and also on other days, and it was used often. The sick were anointed with the oil of the lamps that burned in churches or before particular relics.[330] Funeral services were celebrated for the deceased on the third, ninth, and fortieth day after their death, and on the anniversary of their decease.[331]

Lastly, to crown all these Christian practices (which, though they may have often been regarded in an altogether too external, and perhaps even pharisaical spirit, nevertheless testify to the existence of a real substratum of religion), we must mention the growth of monasticism. After making its first appearance in Egypt, it spread rapidly in Palestine, Syria, Cappadocia, and around Constantinople. Monastic life, whether considered as eremitical or conventual, is the expression of a more complete Christianity and a higher Christian perfection. Being bound to practise celibacy and poverty, and often to obey an abbot, poorly fed, as a rule, and poorly clad, and fasting often, the monks were looked upon by the ordinary faithful as *the* men of God. Not all

[328] Cf. below Chapt. X.

[329] See the order of ceremonies given after a MS. of the end of the 8th century, in F. C. Conybeare, *Rituale Armenorum*, p. 415 and foll. Cf. Theodore the Lector, *Eccles. histor.*, lib. II, 48 (*P. G.*, LXXXVI, 1, 209).

[330] *Vita Eutychii*, VI, 45, 49, 57, 58 (*P. G.*, LXXXVI, 2, col. 2325, 2329, 2340, 2341).

[331] *Novella* CXXXIII (of the year 539), *P. L.*, LXXII, col. 1047.

came up to that ideal, but many tended towards it, and we need but read the historians and ascetical writers of the time — Isidore of Pelusium, St. Nilus, Theodoret's *Religious History,* Cyril of Scythopolis, St. John Climacus, John Moschus, and others — to be convinced that the virtues of their heroes were genuine and solid. Hence the monks were popular, and with the exception of cases where heresy got hold of them and transformed them into fanatics, their influence for good was immense. Placed as they were between the clergy and the people, they explained to the latter the scientific formulas of dogma, and, on the other hand, introduced into the Church certain simple and withal innocuous forms of popular piety. There are still extant many decrees and ordinances of councils and emperors regarding their dwellings, prayers, food, and other details of their lives. But this belongs to the history of discipline rather than to that of dogma.

§ 11. Eschatology.

Before the Redemption, says St. Cyril of Alexandria, the souls of the departed descended directly into limbo; now those of the just can enter into paradise.[332] He holds that final retribution follows death immediately; and this is also the sentiment of St. Nilus [333] and, probably, of Theodoret.[334] Even St. Maximus seems to allude to a particular judgment after death, in which those whose works are neither altogether good nor altogether bad, are purified through fear as by fire.[335] Whilst this assertion sounds like an intimation of purgatory, it must be said that it is the only form in

[332] *In psalm.* XLVIII, 16 (col. 1073).
[333] *Epist.* IV, 14 (col. 556, 557).
[334] *Graec. affect. curatio,* VIII (col. 1024).
[335] *Quaestiones et dubia,* Interrog. X (col. 792).

which that doctrine is directly found among the Greeks at the time which we are now considering.

Belief in the resurrection of the body is so ancient that it is hardly worth while to mention it as one of the beliefs held during the 5th–7th century; it is affirmed and defended time and again.[336] Deserving of especial mention in this regard is the treatise of Æneas of Gaza, composed about the year 530.[337] The author's purpose is to prove the fact of the resurrection and to explain what kind of a body will be reunited to the soul. It will be the very same as that from which the soul had departed; for, he observes, it is but right that, after the resurrection, the same body should be judged, and either suffer or rejoice with the soul, which has made use of it here below. But does not the scattering and transformation of the material elements make this impossible? To answer this difficulty, Æneas outlines an explanation which is very similar to that given by St. Gregory of Nyssa. All living bodies consist of matter and form. The matter is dissolved and scattered; but the form (τοῦ εἴδους ὁ λόγος) is immortal. That form,— which the author regards as an active and directive idea or concept,— recomposes the matter and restores to it the same disposition it had before being dissolved; in other words, it reconstructs the body. We see this taking place, for instance, in a grain of wheat that reproduces itself. Now, if the form of ordinary living beings is thus indestructible, this must *a fortiori* be true of the immortal soul of man. The soul, then, that dwells in that

[336] Cf. for instance Cyril, *In psalm.* IV, 10 (col. 1097); *In Lucam*, XX, 27, 37 (col. 892); *In Oseam*, I, 11 (col. 56); Theodoret, *Quaest. in Genesim*, Interrog. 54 (col. 157); Isid. Pelus., *Epist.* I, 284; IV, 201; St. Nilus, *Epist.* I, 111–113; II, 200.

[337] This treatise, entitled *Theophrastes, sive de animarum immortalitate et corporum resurrectione* is found in *P. G.*, LXXXV, 872 and foll. The treatment of the resurrection of the dead begins at col. 973.

form and knows it fully, can in it and with it reconstitute its former body, and this the more easily since God, who calls each soul in particular, sends each soul to that which belongs to it, *πρὸς τὸ οἰκεῖον*.[338]

During the 6th century, attention was again drawn to this question by a renewal of Origenism. Justinian and his councils dealt vigorously with this heresy.[339] A special condemnation was pronounced in two canons (10 and 11)[340] against those who held that Jesus Christ had risen in an ethereal and spherical body; that men, after the resurrection, will have also ethereal and spherical bodies; that those bodies will be annihilated on the day of judgment, and that afterwards there will be only spirits in this world. On the other hand, theologians declared that, whilst the risen body is no doubt the same as that which is dead, yet the risen bodies of the just will be spiritual (*πνευματικὸν σῶμα*), because henceforth they will be free from the needs of nature, obey the direction of the Holy Ghost, and be used only for the spiritual functions of the soul (*εἰς μόνα βλέπον τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος*).[341]

The resurrection of the body will be followed by the judgment, a subject on which the writers who now engage us, particularly the ascetic writers, dwell often and profusely, with a view to stimulate souls and to bring sinners to repentance.[342] The last judgment will bring the separation of the just from the reprobates. The latter category includes

[338] Col. 981.

[339] Cf. above, pp. 129, 130.

[340] Hahn, *Bibliothek*, § 175.

[341] Cyril, *In Lucam*, XX, 27 (col. 892); XXIV, 38 (col. 948); St. Nilus, *Epist.* II, 78, 82; St. Maximus, *Epist.* VII (col. 433).

[342] Cyril, *In Isaiam*, XXIV, 7–12, 13 (col. 540 and foll.); *Homiliae diversae*, XIV (col. 1072 and foll.); Isid. Pelus., *passim;* St. Nilus, *passim;* St. Maximus, *Epist.* I (col. 384 and foll.).

not only infidels and idolaters, but all those who have loved what was unjust and shameful (*ἐκτόπων ἐπιδευμάτων ἐρασταί*).[343] Anastasius Sinaita asks the question whether children who die unbaptized must be reckoned among the reprobates. He does not take a definite stand, but leans to the negative (*ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ οὐκ εἰσέρχεσθαι αὐτὰ εἰς γεένναν*), for the reason that it would not be right to make children suffer for the sins of their parents.[344] All leading theologians agreed that the punishment of the damned will last forever. After the final judgment, they say, sinners can no longer change their dispositions;[345] therefore their sufferings will never cease; fire is to be one of their torments; "they shall be," in the words of St. Cyril, "a prey to a consuming fire," *πυρὸς ἔσονται παμφάγου τροφή*,[346] which shall never be extinguished.[347]

As to the just, they shall enter the heavenly dwellings, where they will see God and receive their reward, honors and crowns, and where even their bodies will be glorified.[348] However, their bliss will be greater or less in proportion to their merits.[349] The material world itself will be renewed and, after sharing in the afflictions and longings of the friends of God, will also share in the renewal of their youth.[350]

As the reader may notice, there is nothing new in these

[343] Cyril, *In Isaiam*, XXIV, 14 (col. 545).

[344] *Quaestiones*, qu. LXXXI (col. 709).

[345] Cyril, *In psalm.* XXIV, 10 (col. 857); Theodoret, *In Cantic. cantic.*, III (col. 173); St. Nilus, *Epist.* IV, 14.

[346] *In Isaiam*, XXIV, 13 (col. 544).

[347] Theodoret, *In Isaiam*, LXV, 20 (col. 485 and foll.); Isid. Pelus., *Epist.* I, 267; IV, 204; St. Nilus, *Epist.* II, 164; Anastas. Sin., *Hodegos*, V, col. 101; St. Maximus, *Epist.* I (col. 389).

[348] Cyril, *In Isaiam*, XXIV, 13 (col. 544); *In Oseam*, I, 11 (col. 56, 57); St. Nilus, *Epist.* II, 78, 82 (col. 236, 237).

[349] Theodoret, *In cantic. cantic.*, I (col. 61).

[350] Theodoret, *In psalm.* CI, 26, 27 (col. 1684); *In epist. ad Ephes.*, I, 10 (col. 512); St. Maximus, *Mystagogia*, VI (col. 686).

teachings. They merely reiterate the belief of previous ages and give it a more definite form on a number of points. At the end of the 7th century Greek theological thought is, as it were, exhausted, and waits for the authors of the *summae* to come and sum it up for all ages.

CHAPTER VIII

SEMI-PELAGIANISM AND THE DEFINITIONS OF THE SECOND COUNCIL OF ORANGE [1]

§ 1. The Semi-Pelagian Doctrine. Cassian.

We have recorded in the second volume of this work the condemnation of Pelagianism by councils and popes in the first third of the 5th century, and the teaching that had been formulated by St. Augustine against this error. The councils and popes had almost exclusively emphasized the existence of original sin and the necessity of grace for good works; St. Augustine had delved into the subject more deeply and studied the problem of supernatural life under almost all its aspects. But however great the authority of the Bishop of Hippo, it could not be identified with that of the Church; and some of his theories (for instance, that of the distribution of grace and predestination) were so crude and harsh, at least in expression, that they were misunderstood and gave rise to legitimate opposition.

We know that as early as the year 427, when Augustine's CXCIVth letter to Sixtus [2] was read in the monastery of

[1] General studies: G. F. Wiggers, *Versuch einer pragmatischen Darstellung des Augustinismus und Pelagianismus*, tom. II, Hamburg, 1833. P. Sublet, *Le semipélagianisme*, Namur, 1897. F. Woerter, *Beiträge zur Dogmengeschichte des Semipelagianismus*, Paderborn, 1898; *Zur Dogmengeschichte des Semipelagianismus*, Münster, 1900. J. Turmel, *Saint Augustin et la controverse semi-pélagienne; La controverse semi-pélagienne après saint Augustin*, in the *Revue d'hist. et de littérat. relig.*, IX (1904), p. 418–433 and 497–518.

[2] Written in the year 418.

Hadrumetum, in Byzacene, quarrels and disturbances arose among the inmates. The monk Florus, who had made the letter known, was accused by several of his brethren of denying free-will and the just retribution of human works by God on the day of judgment. On the other hand, another monk had inferred from the master's teaching that all correction was useless, since God does everything in us, and we have nothing to do with our actions. St. Augustine himself cleared away the misinterpretations, corrected exaggerated conclusions, and explained his former writings. He did this in two treatises, *De gratia et libero arbitrio* and *De correptione et gratia,* which seem to have restored peace at Hadrumetum.[3]

But this was only the beginning. The real fight was preparing in Southern Gaul. There, theologians received indeed the decisions of the African councils and the Popes, but nothing more. They looked upon several of St. Augustine's theories, if not as manifest errors, at least as dangerous exaggerations. Unfortunately they failed to distinguish between what was unquestionable truth and disputable theory, and to draw from previous decisions the conclusions that ought to have been drawn. Rejecting Pelagianism as a whole, they upheld some of its more subtle errors, and when confronted with the abstruse questions that were then being agitated, some remained or became heretics for fear of falling into the opposite extreme. These were called Semi-Pelagians.[4]

The first author of that time in whose works we find Semi-

[3] Cf. the complete and careful account of the occurrence by M. Jacquin, in the *Revue d'Histoire ecclésiastique,* V (1904), p. 266 and foll.

[4] We may observe that the word Semi-Pelagianism is unknown to antiquity. St. Prosper styles Semi-Pelagians "pelagianae pravitatis reliquiae' (*Inter epist. August.,* epist. CCXXV, 7). The term is, however, quite appropriate.

Pelagian ideas expressed, is the abbot of St. Victor of Marseilles, John Cassian.[5] Cassian had sojourned in Egypt, in Palestine, and at Constantinople, where he had been raised to the diaconate by St. John Chrysostom. The deep impression which the latter had made on his mind accounts for the very slender liking he conceived for St. Augustine's teaching. Cassian, who never forgot St. Chrysostom's continual exhortations to personal effort and action, and who, besides, had daily to encourage his monks on the way of self-renunciation and sacrifice, could not understand the passivity to which the Bishop of Hippo seemed to reduce the human will under the influence of grace. If God really does everything in us, where does merit come in? And if we can do nothing without grace, what becomes of our liberty?

It is mainly in the XIIIth conference, *De protectione Dei,* written between 420 and 426, that Cassian has laid down his principles. He seems at first fully to share the views of St. Augustine, and affirms "non solum actuum verum etiam cogitationum bonarum ex Deo esse principium, qui nobis et initia sanctae voluntatis inspirat, et virtutem atque opportunitatem eorum quae recte cupimus tribuit peragendi" (3). Men need the divine help "in omnibus," and human frailty can do nothing "quod ad salutem pertinet per se solam, id est sine adiutorio Dei perficere" (6).[6] But soon he formu-

[5] Cassian is quoted here from the *P. L.,* vol. XLIX, L. The *Conferences* are found in the XLIXth volume.— Studies: A. Hoch, *Lehre des Johannes Cassianus,* Freiburg i. B., 1895. O. Abel, *Studien über den gallischen Presbyter Johannes Cassianus,* München, 1904. J. Laugier, *Saint Jean Cassien et sa doctrine sur la grâce,* Lyon, 1908.

[6] Cf. *Collat.* III, 16, 19. In the 18th chapter of the XIIIth conference, Cassian sums up the function of grace according to the Fathers (*ab omnibus Patribus*) as follows: "Primum ut accendatur unusquisque ad desiderandum omne quod bonum est, sed ita ut in alterutram partem plenum sit liberae voluntatis arbitrium. Itemque etiam secundum, divinae esse gratiae ut effici valeant exercitia praedicta virtutum, sed ita ut possibilitas non exstinguatur arbitrii. Tertium quo-

lates his teaching more precisely. He says that, at least now and then, we can ourselves make a beginning of good will: "In his omnibus et gratia Dei et libertas nostri declaratur arbitrii, et quia suis interdum motibus homo ad virtutum appetitus possit extendi, semper vero indigeat adiuvari. . . . Etiam per naturae bonum quod beneficio creatoris indultum est, nonnunquam bonarum voluntatum prodire principia, quae tamen, nisi a Domino dirigantur, ad consummationem virtutum pervenire non possunt"[7] (9). A freedom that would not enable a man to will and do what is good of himself (*a semetipso*), would not be genuine liberty (12).[8] Hence, before dispensing His grace, God demands and expects of us previous efforts, "ut nonnunquam etiam ab eo [arbitrio] quosdam conatus bonae voluntatis [gratia Dei] vel exigat vel exspectet"[9] (13). Men are called by Him in various ways: some, like Andrew and Peter, are called before they even think of it; others, like Zaccheus, are called after they have already turned to God (*ad conspectum se Domini fideliter extendentem*); again, others, like Paul, are, as it were, carried away in spite of themselves (*invitum ac repugnantem*) (15, 17, 18).

Once he is called by God and illuminated by His light, man can of himself believe and have the faith (14),[10] for he can freely either reject or follow divine grace: "Manet in homine semper liberum arbitrium quod gratiam Dei possit

que ad Dei munera pertinere ut acquisitae virtutis perseverantia teneatur, sed ita ut captivitatem libertas addicta non sentiat. Sic enim universitatis Deus omnia in omnibus credendus est operari ut incitet, protegat atque confirmet, non ut auferat quam semel ipse concessit arbitrii libertatem." The reader will perceive the great difference between the tone of this passage and that of St. Augustine's treatises, even though both embody the same doctrine.

[7] Col. 918–920; cf. 8, col. 912, 913; 12, col. 928.

[8] Col. 925, 927.

[9] Col. 932.

[10] Col. 936.

vel negligere vel amare"[11] (12, 13; *Collat.* iii, 19). Cassian conceives grace not as an *auxilium quo volumus,* but rather, as St. Augustine conceived the grace of the first man in the state of innocence, *viz.:* an *auxilium sine quo non volumus.* Grace calls, solicits, and inclines us, but it does not compel us to will.

However, whilst man can at times have the thought and desire of good by himself, and can of himself answer the divine call, he cannot accomplish the good that he has conceived and desired, nor do that to which God calls him, without the aid of grace (9).[12] For doing good and persevering therein, supernatural help is absolutely necessary. Hence, Cassian concludes, let us not say that grace is not gratuitous, nor that there is parity between our efforts and the future reward, for those efforts amount to nothing if compared to the action of grace and the greatness of the reward (13).[13] Nor let us say, with the Pelagians, that grace is bestowed on man because he has merited it, and in proportion to his merit; unlike them, we must not ascribe the whole work of salvation to free-will, which can claim only the least share in that work, or, at times, no share whatever: "Absoluta plane pronuntiamus sententia etiam exuberare gratiam Dei et transgredi interdum humanae infidelitatis angustias"[14] (16).

Yet, no matter what Cassian said to the contrary, to his mind the last word in the problem of salvation ultimately depended on free-will. To deny that God wills to save all men was regarded by him as an awful blasphemy; he absolutely rejected predestination *ante praevisa merita,* and held that grace is given to all indifferently, and that the use

[11] Col. 929, 933.
[12] Col. 920.
[13] Col. 934.
[14] Col. 942.

or abuse which we make of it determines our salvation or condemnation.[15]

However, these last mentioned points are not as fully developed by Cassian as the question of the power of nature and the efficacy of grace. In order to have a more complete exposition of what was thought about them in the monasteries of Provence,[16] we must consult two letters written in 429 by St. Prosper and Hilary to St. Augustine.[17] Prosper and Hilary had heard some of the monks question, with a great deal of animus, Augustine's theories on the economy of salvation.[18] They gathered up these views and transmitted them to the Bishop of Hippo for refutation.

In regard to man's power to conceive good thoughts, form salutary desires, regret the past, and begin to believe, without the help of grace, the teaching of the monks agrees with that of Cassian.[19] Whilst we cannot, through the power of nature alone, have a full faith (*fides integra*), we can at least regret our weakness (*dolor compunctae infirmitatis*),[20] we can beg, seek, and knock at the door of divine mercy. The Augustinian distinction between grace, as an *auxilium quo* and as an *auxilium sine quo non,* is regarded as unreal: there is but an *auxilium sine quo non,* bestowed upon a nature which is indeed fallen and weakened, but not altogether unable to do good.[21] Strictly speaking, grace does not precede, but merely accompanies the determination of the will and the performance of the meritorious act: "gratiam

[15] *Collat.* XIII, 7, 17, 18; XVII, 25.

[16] At St. Victor of Marseilles and at Lerins.

[17] They are printed among the letters of St. Augustine, CCXXV and CCXXVI.

[18] None of the opponents is named, except the bishop of Arles, Hilary, who had been formerly a monk at Lerins.

[19] *Epist.* CCXXV, 4; cf. 6; CCXXVI, 2, 4.

[20] *Epist.* CCXXVI, 5.

[21] *Epist.* CCXXVI, 6.

Dei . . . comitem, non praeviam humanorum volunt esse meritorum." [22] It is always understood, however, that grace is necessary to enable a man to act and perform the good works which he has conceived and willed.[23] On this point all agree.

Grace is offered to all men. All are called by the natural, or the written, or the evangelical law, for God wills the salvation of all: "indifferenter universos . . . salvos fieri et in agnitionem veritatis venire." Hence it depends on man whether he will be saved or not, for he can always correspond to the divine call.[24] It depends on him whether he will persevere, since perseverance is granted to the first good will; it can "suppliciter emereri vel amitti contumaciter." [25] It depends also on man whether he will be one of the predestined, for predestination is neither absolute nor *ante praevisa merita,* but follows God's prevision of the merits of those whom He has predestined: "eos praedestinasse in regnum suum quos gratis vocatos, dignos futuros electione et de hac vita bono fine excessuros esse praeviderit." [26] Hence, as far as the divine will is concerned, the number of the predestined is not settled. All men can become predestined, since each has it in his own power to merit election or reprobation.[27]

This principle is so general and true that it must be extended even to cases to which it seems hardly applicable. For instance, if the Gospel has been preached in such or such a place rather than elsewhere, it is because God has foreseen the conditional faith of those so favored, and

[22] *Epist.* CCXXV, 5.
[23] *Epist.* CCXXVI, 2, 4.
[24] *Epist.* CCXXV, 3, 4, 6.
[25] *Epist.* CCXXVI, 4.
[26] *Epist.* CCXXV, 3, 6.
[27] *Epist.* CCXXV, 2, 6; CCXXVI, 4, 5, 7.

the conditional incredulity of the others.[28] If some children die after receiving baptism, and others before receiving it, it is because God has foreseen the good or the evil which both would have done, had they lived; He simply rewards or punishes them beforehand.[29] Thus, there is nothing arbitrary in God's conduct. Unlike several principles in the Augustinian theory, there is nothing in this theory that would lead to despair or sloth. Unless solved in this way, the problems of predestination can only disturb and scandalize the weak. On the whole, it is best for both sides to remain silent on these unfathomable questions.[30]

This is a brief sketch of the opinions that were prevalent in the monasteries of Southern Gaul in 429, according to Prosper and Hilary. At a much later date these views were qualified by theologians as Semi-Pelagianism. They may be summed up in the three following propositions:

(1) Man is able, without grace, to desire and will, but not to perform, supernaturally good deeds; he can begin to believe, but he can not impart to himself complete faith.

(2) God wills all men to be saved and offers to all the grace of salvation. All can coöperate with His grace and persevere in it, if they will.

(3) There is no absolute predestination; predestination and reprobation, considered in God, are consequent upon His foreknowledge of the merits and demerits of each individual; considered in man, they are merely the consequences of his conduct.

Of these three propositions the first alone seems at first blush reprehensible and tainted by Pelagianism; the other two, whilst calling for further explanation, on the whole fairly express the constant belief of the faithful. This mix-

[28] *Epist.* CCXXVI, 3.
[29] *Epist.* CCXXV, 5.
[30] *Epist.* CCXXV, 3; CCXXVI, 2, 5, 8.

ture of truth and falsehood was apt to make the task of refuting them rather difficult.

The conclusion of St. Prosper's letter (8) is of particular interest, because it points out plainly to St. Augustine the questions he was expected to answer, and lays down very neatly the problem of predestination *ante* or *post praevisa merita*. We have already seen how St. Augustine complied with the request of his two disciples by composing the treatises *De praedestinatione sanctorum* and *De dono perseverantiae*,[31] and how he answered the objections that had been raised against his views. Whilst these writings strengthened his two correspondents in their conviction, they did not convince his opponents, and the quarrel between Augustinians and Semi-Pelagians went on in Southern Gaul. The Bishop of Hippo did not live to see its sequel; he died on August 28, 430. The task of upholding his cause and continuing his work devolved on Prosper.

§ 2. St. Prosper's Opposition.[32]

Prosper was a layman, and must have been about forty years old when St. Augustine died. An Augustinian through and through, he had identified himself, as it were, with his master and claimed but to reëcho his teaching.[33] We shall see how far this claim was justified. Prosper had taken up the pen against the new errors even before the demise of Augustine. His letter to Rufinus and his poem *De ingratis* date from 429 or from the early part of 430.

[31] Originally these two treatises were parts of one and the same work.

[32] The works of St. Prosper are found in *P. L.*, vol. LI. Studies: L. Valentin, *Saint Prosper d'Aquitaine*, Paris, 1900. M. Jacquin, *La question de la prédestination aux V^e^ et VI^e^ siècles*, in the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, VII (1906), p. 269 and foll.

[33] *Respons. ad capita Gallorum*, col. 156, 157.

Immediately after it come the *Pro Augustino responsiones ad excerpta Genuensium,*[34] which consists of explanations given to Camillus and Theodore, two priests of Genoa, on nine passages of the *De praedestinatione sanctorum* and *De dono perseverantiae.* The death of Augustine made his opponents bolder; about the same time, some Gallic theologians, who shared the views of Lerins and St. Victor, launched forth fifteen propositions claiming to sum up accurately the Augustinian teaching on predestination, God's salvific will, the dispensation of the Gospel, the part which God has in sin, the end of creation, etc., and presented it in a very unfavorable light and, on the whole, inaccurately. Prosper replied by the *Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula obiectionum gallorum calumniantium,* and started for Rome to obtain aid from Pope Celestine. In 431, the latter sent to the bishops of Southern Gaul a letter[35] in which he blames them for letting ordinary priests speak on these questions, and extols St. Augustine's authority, although he lays down no definite teaching on the problems that had been raised. Another pamphlet, more bitter than the first, was composed probably by St. Vincent of Lerins[36] on the part of the monks of Provence. It sums up in sixteen skilfully arranged propositions the teaching of both St. Augustine and St. Prosper. They are represented as denying that God wills the salvation of all men and that Jesus died for all; as teaching that God is the author of all the evil deeds done by the unpredestined, and of their damnation, because the unpredestined sin of necessity, and

[34] This is the view of M. Jacquin, art. quoted, p. 277.

[35] This is the *Epist.* XXI (*P. L.,* vol. L, col. 528, and vol. XLV, 1755). It is followed by a series of papal decisions on questions of grace, that are not the work of St. Celestine. We shall recur to this subject.

[36] Cf. his *Commonitorium,* 26.

when they ask God that "His will be done," they really pray against their own eternal interests. St. Prosper answered this attack by the treatise *Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula obiectionum vincentianarum.* Lastly, realizing that the authority of Cassian was a bulwark of his enemies that must be overthrown, he wrote, in 433–434, the *De gratia Dei et libero arbitrio liber contra Collatorem,* in which he attacked and tried to refute especially the XIIIth conference. If we add to these works a collection of sayings gathered from St. Augustine's writings, compiled by Prosper towards the end of his life (about 451), we have a complete list of his writings on the subject of grace.

As has been observed, Prosper in these writings claims to reproduce the genuine teaching of St. Augustine. This is true of the *Letter to Rufinus,* the poem *De ingratis,* and the *Answer to the Genoese.* But in his other works Prosper, under the pressure of controversy, adopts the theory of predestination to hell *post praevisa merita,* and expresses himself so ambiguously and with so much hesitancy on other points, that some critics have been led to mistake his true sentiments. On the whole, however, he was a faithful pupil of his great master and staunchly supported his teaching.

We need not, therefore, enter into the details of his teaching, especially in so far as it refers to the condemned Pelagian errors. It will suffice to present an outline of his answers to the propositions of the Semi-Pelagians.

The Semi-Pelagians contended that human nature and free-will have not been radically vitiated by original sin, but are able to accomplish some moral good, and even to desire and will supernatural good, to pray and begin the work of salvation. Prosper stoutly denies this. Nature, he says, is absolutely incapable of beginning the work of salvation; grace alone can save free-will from the abyss into which it has fallen and from Satan's dominion, under which it

groans. We can reach God only through God, and can have no *initium fidei* except through the Holy Ghost:

"Liberum arbitrium . . . ante illuminationem fidei in tenebris . . . et in umbra mortis agere non recte negatur. Quoniam priusquam a dominatione diaboli per Dei gratiam liberetur, in illo profundo iacet in quod se sua libertate demersit. Amat ergo languores suos, et pro sanitate habet quod aegrotare se nescit, donec prima haec medela conferatur aegroto ut incipiat nosse quod langueat et possit opem medici desiderare qua surgat." [37]—"Qui credunt Dei aguntur Spiritu. . . . Conversio ergo nostra ad Deum non ex nobis, sed ex Deo est." [38]

Nay, without grace and without the grace of faith, nature is unable to accomplish even merely morally good actions, and all the righteousness of infidels is only apparent, not to say, reprehensible sinfulness:

"Intellegat iustitiam infidelium non esse iustitiam quia sordet natura sine gratia."—"Habent quidem pietatis similitudinem sed non habent veritatem." [39]

> "Edite constanter naturae vulnera victae,
> Exutam virtute animam, caecataque cordis
> Lumina, et in poenam propriam iaculis superatis,
> Armatum arbitrium nunquam consurgere posse
> Inque novos lapsus semper nitendo resolvi." [40]

The other assertion of the Semi-Pelagians referred to the dispensation of grace and its mode of operation. All

[37] *Respons. ad cap. Gallorum*, 6.

[38] *Epist. ad Rufin.*, 7, 6; *De ingratis*, v. 561 and foll.; 695 and foll.; *Respons. ad exc. Genuens.*, 5; *Contra Collator.*, IV, 1. 2; VI; IX, 1–3.

[39] *Epist. ad Rufin.*, 8, 9, 18; *Cont. Collator.*, X, 2; XI, 1.

[40] *De ingratis*, v. 526 and foll.; 450, 584 and foll.; 599 and foll.; *Contra Coll.*, IX, 3; XIII, 6.

men, they claimed, are equally (*indifferenter*) called, but grace is more especially offered to those who are better prepared to receive it. Free-will may accept or reject it at its pleasure; the efficacy of grace comes from the will, and consequently the merit of good works results from the parallel action of grace and free-will.

St. Prosper rejects, or at least limits, these assertions. To represent grace as a reward of good will and human merits, he says, savors of Pelagianism.[41] Furthermore, it is untrue to say that all men are called *indifferenter,* because, as a matter of fact, a great many have never had the Gospel preached to them, and even among those to whom it has been preached, many have heard the message without having their hearts opened to its teachings.[42] Lastly, if it is certain that free-will is not compelled by grace but rather exercised under its influence,[43] it is just as certain that it is grace that makes us will and act, that it is through grace that we coöperate with grace, and that when we follow its impulse, grace is for us an *auxilium quo.*[44] "Quoties enim bona agimus, Deus in nobis atque nobiscum ut operemur operatur." The human will is not only governed by grace, it is, so to speak, *actioned.* Now, "Plus est procul dubio agi quam regi. Qui enim regitur aliquid agit . . . qui autem agitur agere ipse aliquid vix intellegitur." These two sayings are from St. Augustine, and Prosper makes them his own.[45] Thus, although the freedom of the converted sinner remains intact, his conversion is the work of God: "Non a

[41] *De ingratis,* v. 287 and foll., 415 and foll., 426 and foll., etc.; *Cont. Collat.,* IX, 1; XI, 1, 2.

[42] *Resp. ad capit. Gallor.,* 4, 5.

[43] *Contra Collat.,* VI; XVIII, 3; *Sentent. sup. cap. Gallor.,* 6; *Respons. ad cap. Gallor.,* 6; *Resp. ad exc. Genuens.,* 4.

[44] *Resp. ad cap. Gallor.,* 6; *Contra Collat.,* XIII, 6.

[45] *Liber sententiarum,* 22, 312. He merely adds, in the first, the words *atque nobiscum,* which is quite significant.

seipso sed a creatore mutatur, ut quidquid in eo in melius reficitur nec sine illo sit qui sanatur, nec nisi ab illo sit qui medetur." [46] Hence the conclusion that our merits are gifts from God, and that we must not ascribe them to ourselves, as though they were our own:

". . . Tu [Deus] vota petentis
Quae dari vis tribuis, servans largita creansque
De meritis merita, et cumulans tua dona coronis." [47]

But does God will the salvation of all men? Our readers may recall the embarrassed answer St. Augustine gave to this question, for lack of having clearly distinguished between God's *antecedent* and *consequent* will. St. Prosper is no less embarrassed. He realizes what an awful thing it would be to deny that God wills to save all men, and writes: "Item qui dicit quod non omnes homines velit Deus salvos fieri sed certum numerum praedestinatorum durius loquitur quam loquendum est de altitudine immutabilis gratiae Dei, qui et omnes vult salvos fieri et in agnitionem veritatis venire." [48] Again: "Sincerissime credendum atque profitendum est, Deum velle ut omnes homines salvi fiant." [49] But even in this last-quoted passage he implies that there are exceptions and that God, in making those exceptions, was guided by reasons of which we are ignorant. He admits that God's salvific will is realized only in the predestined, whose number is unalterably predetermined.[50] Prosper's teaching, then, is not as plain as it seems at first blush, and noting further that, in the poem *De ingratis*,[51] he seems to

[46] *Contra Collat.*, XII, 4; VIII, 2, 3.
[47] *De ingrat.*, v. 983 and foll.; cf. 611 and foll.; *Contra Collat.*, XVI, 2.
[48] *Sententia sup. cap.* 8 *Gallorum.*
[49] *Respons. ad capit. vincent.*, 2.
[50] *Sent. super cap.* 8 *Gallor.*; *Epist. ad Rufin.*, 12.
[51] Verse 313 and foll.

deny God's will to save all men, and, in his letter to Rufinus (14), puts the same arbitrary construction on *1 Timothy*, II, 4, as St. Augustine, we are led to conclude that, because he failed to make the important distinctions just noted, Prosper found himself unable to lay down a clear teaching on the subject of God's salvific will and to abide by it firmly. The same thing may be said of what he writes on the subject of the universality of the redemption.[52]

Nevertheless, his theory of predestination gave St. Prosper the means of solving the question of God's will to save all men more readily than St. Augustine had been able to do. As our readers will recall, the latter had admitted absolute predestination *ante praevisa merita vel demerita,* both for the elect and the reprobates. The theologians of Provence, who rejected that theory as monstrous, on the contrary held that predestination is conditioned by God's foreknowledge of the merits and demerits of each individual human being. In his last works, Prosper — unfaithful to his master's teaching — adopts a middle course. He says that the elect are predestined gratuitously, *i.e.,* independently of their good works, " ut et qui salvantur ideo salvi sint quia illos voluit Deus salvos fieri "; [53] but the wicked have been predestined to damnation only in consequence of God's foreseeing their sins: " Non ex eo necessitatem pereundi habuerunt quia praedestinati non sunt, quia tales futuri ex vo-

[52] *Resp. ad cap. Gallor.,* 9; *Resp. ad cap. vincent.,* 1; *Sentent. super cap. Gallor.,* 8, 9.— Prosper's views regarding the number of the elect are equally unsettled. Before the advent of Christianity, he remarks, grace saved but few men (*paucos*); but " nunc de universo genere hominum salvat innumeros " (*Resp. ad exc. Genuens.,* 6). Many are saved (*De ingrat.,* v. 645 and foll.). Elsewhere, he seems to hold that the number of the elect is equal to that of the reprobates (*De ingr.,* v. 703–705; *Resp. ad cap. vincent.,* 2).

[53] *Sentent. super cap. Gallor.,* 8, 9 (Cf. *Epist. ad Rufin.,* 13–16). The two texts that have been quoted to prove that Prosper held the predestination of the elect *post praevisa merita,* are not at all conclusive.

luntaria praevaricatione praesciti sunt." "Vires itaque oboedientiae non ideo cuiquam subtraxit, quia eum non praedestinavit, sed ideo non praedestinavit quia recessurum ab ipsa oboedientia esse praevidit."[54] We need not add that Prosper rejects with horror the idea of a predestination to evil and sin. Evil is foreseen by God, but is not His work.[55]

These are the main outlines of the teaching which St. Prosper opposed to those theologians who disparaged St. Augustine and divine grace. Notwithstanding the vigor of his argumentation and his literary ability, he did not succeed in converting his adversaries. Cassian, whom he had directly attacked, did not condescend to answer; Pope Xystus III, whom he had indirectly entreated to intervene, did not intervene; and in the year 434, Vincent of Lerins published his *Commonitorium,* in which, under the mask of ancient heretics, fond of novelties, St. Augustine seems to be aimed at.

The weakness of Prosper's defence came from the fact that he represented the particular views of the Bishop of Hippo as the teaching of the Church. Rome refused to admit this identification. As has been said above, there is now annexed to Celestine's XXIst letter to the bishops of Gaul, a whole series of decisions of former Popes — *i.e.,* Innocent and Zosimus — on the subject of grace.[56] It is probable that the author of this document, which appeared under Xystus III (432–440), is the deacon Leo, who afterwards became Pope Leo I. Even though the document was

[54] *Resp. ad cap. Gallor.,* 3, 12; cf. 2, 7; *Sentent. sup. cap. 7 Gallor.*; *Resp. ad cap. vincent.,* 12, 16.

[55] *Resp. ad cap. Gallor.,* 3, 6, 12, 14; *Resp. ad cap. vincent.,* 7, 10, 11, 12, etc.

[56] *Incipiunt praeteritorum sedis apostolicae episcoporum auctoritates de gratia Dei.*

never solemnly promulgated, it gives a very accurate idea of the Roman view at the time it was composed. Now, these canons indeed formally condemn the error of the Semi-Pelagians as regards man's ability of conceiving good desires and holy thoughts without grace, of beginning the work of his conversion and salvation, and coöperating with God's grace and call by his own strength;[57] but nothing is said of grace efficacious by itself, of predestination and God's will to save either all or a certain number of men; nay, these questions are formally set aside. Not as if, the author says, we slight these problems which have been studied by those who have fought the heretics; but because there is no need of solving them in order to have a sound and orthodox faith on the subject of grace; it suffices to accept simply the decisions of the Apostolic See.[58]

[57] Cf. especially n. 10: "Quod ita Deus in cordibus hominum atque in ipso libero operetur arbitrio ut sancta cogitatio, pium consilium, omnisque motus bonae voluntatis ex Deo sit, quia per illum aliquid boni possumus sine quo nihil possumus."

Hence the conclusion (14): "His ergo ecclesiasticis regulis et ex divina sumptis auctoritate documentis . . . confirmati sumus ut omnium bonorum affectuum atque operum et omnium studiorum omniumque virtutum quibus ab initio fidei ad Deum tenditur, Deum profiteamur auctorem, et non dubitemus ab ipsius gratia omnia hominis merita praeveniri, per quem fit ut aliquid boni et velle incipiamus et facere."

Again: "Agit quippe [Deus] in nobis ut quod vult et velimus et agamus, nec otiosa in nobis esse patitur quae exercenda, non negligenda donavit, ut et nos cooperatores simus gratiae Dei."

[58] "Profundiores vero difficilioresque partes incurrentium quaestionum, quas latius pertractarunt qui haereticis restiterunt, sicut non audemus contemnere, ita non necesse habemus astruere, quia ad confitendum gratiam Dei cuius operi ac dignationi nihil penitus subtrahendum est satis sufficere credimus quidquid secundum praedictas regulas apostolicae sedis nos scripta docuerunt: ut prorsus non opinemur catholicum quod apparuerit praefixis sententiis esse contrarium." (15). — This was the attitude of the Roman authorities on the question of grace all during the 5th and at the beginning of the 6th century. They are Augustinian, indeed; but they insist on the rôle played by free-will and disregard the problems of predestination and of a more or

St. Prosper had failed to obtain a solemn condemnation of his opponents; and the latter saw in the blame that Rome inflicted on a part of their teaching, at most a reason to tone down its expression and moderate their language. This they seem to have done. There followed a sort of truce, and the controversy abated for a while. On both sides theologians ceased to dispute among themselves, although they continued busily to write.

It is probably from this epoch — about 434 to 460 — that we must date two anonymous works, the *Hypomnesticon contra pelagianos et caelestianos,*[59] and the *De vocatione omnium gentium.*[60] The latter deserves more than a mere mention. The author, believed by some critics to be St. Prosper himself or the deacon Leo, is a moderate Augustinian,[61] whose aim is to reconcile the fact of the reprobation of many with God's will to save all men, which he admits. To that end he distinguishes two kinds of grace: the general grace of salvation (II, 25), which is offered to all men, "virtute una, quantitate diversa, consilio immutabili, opere multiformi" (II, 5, 31), and a special grace (*specialis gratiae largitas, specialis misericordia,* II, 25) which God owes to none, but gives in fact to many and by which they are effectively saved. Why this special grace is not granted to all, why it is granted to some and not to others, the author is unable to say. In order to extricate himself from obvious difficulties, he is obliged to have recourse to what was the inevitable conclusion of the Augustinian

less irresistible grace. Cf. St. Leo, *Sermo* XXIII, 4; XXXV, 3; XLIX, 3; LXVII, 2, 5; LXXV, 5; *Epist.* I, 3; Gelasius is somewhat more severe, *Epist.* VII. Of Hormisdas we shall speak further on.

[59] *P. L.,* vol. XLV, 1611.

[60] *P. L.,* vol. LI, 647.

[61] The same may be said of the author of the *Hypomnesticon.* Whilst reproducing St. Augustine's teaching, he endeavors to soften some of its more rigid assertions, though at the expense of clearness.

teaching on grace, ever since it was formulated, *i.e.*, to an appeal to the inscrutable abyss of the divine wisdom (I, 13).

§ 3. Faustus and St. Fulgentius.

The truce between the Augustinians and the Semi-Pelagians lasted about forty years. Then an incident occurred that again stirred up the discussion. About 452, Faustus, former abbot of Lerins, had been made bishop of Riez.[62] He was a versatile and cultivated man, of austere morals, a zealous bishop of excellent repute, who had, however, brought from Lerins the views that prevailed there on the subject of grace. One of his priests, Lucidus, espoused Predestinarianism,— the error that regards men as predestined to heaven or hell, and irresistibly pushed to the one or the other, whatever they may do. Faustus tried to bring him back to a safer teaching. When he saw that his entreaties were useless, he threatened, unless he recanted, to have him condemned by a council about to meet at Arles, probably in 473. His letter[63] contained six anathematisms, to which Lucidus was asked to subscribe:[64] (1) Anathema against any one who denies original sin and the necessity of grace for salvation; (2) anathema against any one who maintains that the baptized Christian who becomes a sinner, is lost through Adam and original sin (as though the latter had not been remitted). (3) "Anathema illi qui per Dei praescientiam in mortem deprimi hominem dixerit." (4) "Anathema illi qui dixerit illum qui periit non accepisse ut

[62] Faustus is quoted after the edition of A. Engelbrecht, *Fausti Reiensis . . . opera,* Vindobonae, 1891 (*Corpus script. ecclesiastic. latin.,* tom. XXI). Cf. also *P. L.*, vol. LIII and LVIII. Studies: A. Engelbrecht, *Studien über die Schriften des Bischofs von Reii, Faustus,* Prag, 1889. E. Simon, *Etude sur saint Fauste,* Toulon, 1879. A. Koch, *Der heil. Faustus, Bischof von Riez,* Stuttgart, 1895.

[63] *Epist.* I, Engelbrecht, 161; *P. L.*, LIII, 681.

[64] See them also in Hahn, *Biblioth.*, § 172.

salvus esse posset, id est de baptizato vel de illius aetatis pagano qui credere potuit et noluit." (5) "Anathema illi qui dixerit quod vas contumeliae non possit assurgere ut sit vas in honorem." (6) "Anathema illi qui dixerit quod Christus non pro omnibus mortuus sit nec omnes homines salvos esse velit."

Lucidus finally yielded to Faustus' request, and sent probably to the Council of Lyons which was held a short time after that of Arles — about 474 — a letter[65] in which he accepts the decisions of the Council of Arles (*iuxta praedicandi recentia statuta concilii*), and explains his adhesion by enumerating a certain number of errors which he condemns.[66] This enumeration is even more complete than that of Faustus.

So far everything went smoothly, and the Augustinians themselves could not but be gratified at what had taken place.[67] But the trouble was not over yet. Faustus was

[65] Engelbr., 165; *P. L.*, LIII, 683.

[66] Thus he condemns: "(1) sensum illum qui dicit laborem humanae oboedientiae divinae gratiae non esse iungendum; (2) qui dicit post primi hominis lapsum ex toto arbitrium voluntatis extinctum; (3) qui dicit quod Christus dominus et salvator noster mortem non pro omnium salute susceperit; (4) qui dicit quod praescientia Dei hominem violenter compellat ad mortem, vel quod Dei pereant voluntate qui pereunt; (5) qui dicit quod post acceptum legitime baptismum in Adam moriatur quicumque deliquerit; (6) qui dicit alios deputatos ad mortem, alios ad vitam praedestinatos; (7) qui dicit ab Adam usque ad Christum nullos ex gentibus per primam Dei gratiam, id est per legem naturae in adventum Christi fuisse salvatos, eo quod liberum arbitrium ex omnibus in primo parente perdiderint; (8) qui dicit patriarchas ac prophetas, vel summos quosque sanctorum etiam ante redemptionis tempora in paradisi habitatione deguisse; (9) qui dicit ignes et inferna non esse." Then, at the end: "Profiteor etiam aeternos ignes et infernales flammas factis capitalibus praeparatas, quia perseverantes in finem humanas culpas merito sequitur divina sententia.'

[67] In connection with Lucidus, some critics have asked whether there really existed in the 5th century a fairly important group of Predestinarians. The question arose apropos of a passage in the *Praedestinatus* (*P. L.*, vol. LIII), IId book, which claims to reproduce the

commissioned to condense into a systematic treatise the points of doctrine that had been decided at Arles and Lyons in connection with Predestinarianism. He set himself to the task and wrote the treatise *De gratia libri duo*,[68] which started the dispute anew.

The views of Faustus have received various interpretations. Some critics have looked upon his Semi-Pelagian formulas as mere verbal exaggerations against Predestinarianism;[69] others have found in them a distinctly Semi-Pelagian bias, very close indeed to strict Pelagianism.[70] Whether this last estimate is correct or not, the Semi-Pelagian attitude of Faustus can hardly be denied. To be sure, Faustus protests that he absolutely rejects the errors of Pelagius (I, 1, 2);[71] he asserts that we must assign "primas partes soli gratiae" (I, 5); that grace is the principle of good will and the beginning of good works: "Nihil hic, ut opinor, redolet praesumptionis, cum et hoc ipsum incessabiliter asseram quod Deo ipsam debeam voluntatem, praesertim cum in omnibus eius motibus ad opus gratiae

main ideas of a work that was being circulated under the name of St. Augustine and in which his views on predestination are pushed to the extreme. In matter of fact, the *Praedestinatus* is merely a clever satire, the work of some unknown Pelagian; it was probably composed at Rome or in some other part of Italy between 432 and 445 (cf. Hans von Schubert, *Der sogenannte Praedestinatus, Texte und Unters.*, N. F., IX). Whilst there may have existed some isolated Predestinarians during the 5th and 6th centuries, we can not find an organized sect of that name.

[68] Engelbr., 3 and foll.; *P. L.*, LVIII, 783 and foll. It will be noticed that the divisions of the *P. L.* do not agree entirely with those of Engelbrecht.

[69] For instance, J. Heller, *Fausti Regiensis fides in exponenda gratia Christi*, Monachii, 1854.

[70] This view is held especially by R. Seeberg, *Lehrb. der D.-G.*, II, 516.

[71] All the references without any other indication are to the *De gratia*.

referam vel inchoationis initia vel consummationis extrema" (II, 10). However, he seems to attribute to free-will — whose existence and activity he upholds with vigor [72] — the capability of desiring, hoping, and calling the grace it needs to arise, to will effectively, and to do what is good: "Hominis formator et rector bonae voluntatis homini deputavit usum, sibi reservavit effectum" (I, 9). "In centurione Cornelio, quia praecessit voluntas gratiam, ideo praevenit et gratia regenerationem" (II, 10). "Clamat voluntas, quia sola per se elevari nescit infirmitas. Ita Dominus invitat volentem, adtrahit desiderantem, erigit adnitentem" (I, 16). In this last paragraph, Faustus seems even to go farther and to reduce all graces to the rank of mere external helps: "Quid est autem adtrahere nisi praedicare, nisi Scripturarum consolationibus excitare, increpationibus deterrere, desideranda proponere, intentare metuenda, iudicium comminari, praemium polliceri?"

Grace is offered to all, and to all, even to those whose disobedience God foresaw, it gives "velle et posse" (I, 16; II, 4); but it compels no one: "Placere Domino Deo suo et potuit nolle qui voluit, et potuit velle qui noluit" (I, 11). God does not force on men their final fate, and hence it is easy to solve the problem of predestination. Faustus objects to the term predestination, even in connection with the Holy Innocents; the devil caused them to be killed, he says, and God crowned them (II, 3). Why some children die after and others before baptism, is an obscure and insoluble problem, and we must not seek therein for any light to clear up other questions, such as that of free-will, for the solution of which we have positive data (I, 13).

Faustus' writings do not seem to have given offence, at first, and during the last years of the 5th and the first years

[72] Cf. I, 7, 8, 9, 16; II, 8, 9.

of the 6th century, the theologians of Provence held their views without being molested. These views are voiced especially in the *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* (38, 61, 84, 85) and the *De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus* (21, 56)[73] of Gennadius of Marseilles. But when Faustus' treatise fell into the hands of the Scythian monks at Constantinople,[74] it gave serious offence. In the *De Christo professio,* presented to the legates of Hormisdas soon after their arrival in 519, these monks declared that, since the fall, free-will craves only "carnalia sive saecularia" and is unable, without an infusion of the Holy Ghost, to think and will anything whatever in reference to eternal life.[75] Meanwhile, to ascertain Faustus' standing, they applied to the African bishop Possessor, who was then in exile at Constantinople. He in turn applied to Hormisdas.[76] The Pope's answer, dated August 13, 520,[77] speaks of Faustus as follows: "Neque illum recipi, neque quemquam, quos in auctoritate Patrum non recipit examen catholicae fidei, aut ecclesiasticae disciplinae ambiguitatem posse gignere, aut religiosis praeiudicium comparare." As to the questions of grace and free-will, what the Church teaches, "licet in variis libris beati Augustini, et maxime ad Hilarium et Prosperum[78] possit cognosci, tamen in scriniis ecclesiasticis expressa capitula

[73] The 56th chapter may have been interpolated; chapters 22–51, which reproduce the decisions of the Council of Orange of 529, are undoubtedly spurious. As to the *Commentarii in psalmos* (*P. L.*, LIII, 327), which are often ascribed to Arnobius Junior, and decidedly oppose Augustinian predestination, they are probably of Roman origin and perhaps anterior to Xystus III (L. Duchesne, *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise,* III, p. 283).

[74] Cf. above, p. 124.

[75] *P. G.*, vol. LXXXVI, 1, col. 86.

[76] *Relatio Possessoris afri,* in *P. L.*, LXIII, 489.

[77] This is the *Epist.* LXX (*P. L.*, LXIII, 490), already noted.

[78] The treatises *De praedestinatione sanctorum* and *De dono perseverantiae.*

continentur."[79] Thus the Pope — whilst not forbidding the reading of Faustus' books — did not regard them as authoritative, and advised any one who was anxious to know the authentic teaching of the Church on grace, to consult the works of St. Augustine, particularly his two treatises, *De praedestinatione sanctorum* and *De dono perseverantiae,* or, still more safely, the ecclesiastical decisions, *i.e.,* probably the *auctoritates* gathered at the end of Celestine's XXIst letter.

This somewhat indefinite answer did not satisfy the Scythian monks. Their archimandrite, John Maxentius, in his reply to Hormisdas,[80] blamed him for allowing the reading of the works of an author whose authority the Pope himself refused to acknowledge, and, by comparing the teaching of Faustus with that of St. Augustine, strove to show that the former was a heretic and a Pelagian.[81]

Meanwhile the dispute had extended in another direction. As previously noted,[82] the legates sent to Rome by the Scythian monks lost patience at Hormisdas' delay in approving their Christological formulas and applied to the African bishops who had fled to Sardinia, one of whom was St. Fulgentius.[83] Their communication referred not only to the Incarnation, but also to the question of grace, which they set forth as they understood it (14–28). They asserted particularly the forfeiture of Christian liberty through original sin (17), the impossibility, without grace, "cogitare, velle, seu desiderare divina," and to believe (18, 19, 24), the utter mysteriousness of God's way of distributing His

[79] *P. L.,* LXIII, 492, 493.
[80] *P. G.,* LXXXVI, 1, col. 93 and foll.
[81] *Ibid.,* col. 106, 107 and foll.
[82] P. 126.
[83] *Liber Petri diaconi et aliorum . . . de incarnatione et gratia Domini nostri Iesu Christi ad Fulgentium* (*P. L.,* LXV, 442). This treatise must have been composed in 519 or 520.

graces and working out man's salvation (20–23), in a word, the whole Augustinian teaching. The letter ended with an anathema against Pelagius, Celestius, Julian of Eclanum, and the books of Faustus, "quos contra praedestinationis sententiam scriptos esse non dubium est" (28); it was signed by the monks Peter, John, and Leontius, and by John the lector.

The answer of the bishops came from St. Fulgentius. This is the *Epistula XVII,* better known as the *Liber de incarnatione et gratia Domini nostri Iesu Christi.*[84] Besides this treatise, Fulgentius, shortly afterwards, before returning to Africa (523), wrote three books *Ad Monimum,*[85] of which the first treats of predestination to glory and punishment, and seven books — now lost — *Contra Faustum,* composed at the request of the Scythian monks. On his return to Africa, the indefatigable controversialist did not remain inactive. He composed the *De veritate praedestinationis et gratiae Dei,*[86] and lastly, in the name of a synod of twelve bishops whose views the Scythian monks wished to ascertain, the *Epistula XV,*[87] which was addressed more especially to John and Venerius, and has been embodied in several collections of councils.

These documents enable us to form an idea of the teaching which St. Fulgentius and the African bishops opposed to that of Faustus.[88] Their doctrine is strict Augustinianism, set forth more plainly even than in the works of St. Augustine himself, and shorn of all the attenuations introduced by St. Prosper. To avoid needless repetition, I shall

[84] *P. L.,* LXV, 451 and foll.

[85] *P. L.,* LXV, 153. Monimus, who had some tendencies towards Predestinarianism, had consulted St. Fulgentius.

[86] *P. L.,* LXV, 603.

[87] *P. L.,* LXV, 435.

[88] Cf. on this subject: F. Woerter, *Zur Dogmengeschichte des Semipelagianismus,* 3, *Die Lehre des Fulgentius von Ruspe.*

recall here merely its main points: Original sin, "peccati parentalis macula," transmitted by the concupiscence that accompanies the act of generation;[89] the *massa damnata* and the universal reprobation resulting therefrom;[90] the incapacity of free-will (which still exists), of tending towards any, even purely moral good,[91] the impossibility of pleasing God without theological faith, and the sinful character of all the works of infidels;[92] the necessity of prevenient, coöperating, and subsequent grace for the beginning, progress, and conclusion of good works and salvation;[93] the absolute necessity of a prevenient divine concursus for the very first beginning of good will, the wishing of good, the seeking for it, the *initium fidei,* the *"velle credere"* and, *a fortiori,* for the love of God;[94] the absolute gratuitousness of divine grace, of which no man is worthy and which is given out of sheer mercy, according to God's good pleasure;[95] God working in us the will and the actual deed, al-

[89] *Epist.* XVII, 26, 28; *De verit. praedest.,* I, 3, 7. "Proinde de munditia nuptiarum mundus homo non nascitur, quia interveniente libidine seminatur" (*ibid.,* I, 10). Like St. Augustine, St. Fulgentius abstains from solving the question of the origin of the soul and declares neither for creationism nor for traducianism (*ibid.,* III, 28–32; *Epist.* XV, 15).

[90] *De verit. praedest.,* I, 7.

[91] *De verit. praedest.,* II, 5, 8, 11, 13; *Epist.* XV, 5.

[92] "Quae (voluntas humana) priusquam accipiat fidem, punitionem per seipsam potest mereri, non fidem: *Omne enim quod non est ex fide peccatum est* et *Sine fide impossibile est placere Deo.* Qui autem Deo non placet sine dubio displicet, et qui Deo displicet non eum mitigat sed potius exacerbat. . . . Fidem non habere hoc est Deo displicere" (*De verit. praedest.,* I, 39; cf. *Epist.* XVII, 33).

[93] *De verit. praedest.,* I, 35, 37, 38; II, 20, 21.

[94] *Epist.* XVII, 33, 35, 36; XV, 4; *De verit. praedest.,* I, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38; II, 12, 14, 15, 18; *Ad Monim.,* I, 1, 9.

[95] "Haec Dei gratia qua salvamur non alicui praecedenti merito datur. . . . Vasa misericordiae . . . a vasis irae . . . gratuitae iustificationis munere secernuntur. . . . Ista misericordia neminem reperit dignum, sed omnes indignos invenit, et ex ipsis quos voluerit dignos facit" (*De verit. praedest.,* I, 7, 8, 9, 14, 40; *Epist.* XVII, 42; cf. XV, 10).

though we remain free under the divine impulse and must coöperate with it;[96] therefore, grace is of itself efficacious, and God's knowledge independent of our will and free determination;[97] eternal bliss, the supreme gift that crowns the divine gifts bestowed here below, whilst damnation is the just punishment of our faults.[98]

St. Fulgentius also treats of predestination in the strict Augustinian sense. That predestination is absolute; *i.e.,* God in predestining some and leaving others in the *massa damnata,* did not consider their future works: "Ab illa igitur massa damnata nemo futurorum praescientia operum discernitur, sed miserantis figuli ope atque opere segregatur . . . Propterea vasa misericordiae . . . gratuitae iustificationis munere secernuntur."[99] In predestining the elect to glory, God also predestined them to the merits of which that glory was to be the *reward,* and therefore to a glory which they must conquer;[100] nevertheless, that glory was first decreed *ante praevisa merita.* This is the order: "Gratis [Deus] et vocat praedestinatos, et iustificat vocatos, et glorificat iustificatos."[101] Consequently, *negative* reprobation — *i.e.,* the fact of one's not being chosen — is also *ante prae-*

[96] "Iubet enim Deus homini ut velit, sed Deus in homine operatur et velle; iubet ut faciat, sed Deus in eo operatur et facere" (*Epist.* XV, 13; *Ad Monim.,* I, 9; *De verit. praedest.,* II, 6, 8, 9). "Quod autem vos dicitis sola Dei misericordia salvari hominem, illi autem dicunt, nisi quis propria voluntate cucurrerit et elaboraverit, salvus esse non poterit, digne utrumque tenetur" (*Epist.* XV, 11; XVII, 41, 44, 45, 46; *De verit. praedest.,* II, 25, 27).

[97] *De verit. praedest.,* III, 12, 13.

[98] "Cur autem mors stipendium, vita vero aeterna gratia dicitur, nisi quia illa redditur, haec donatur?"—"In sanctis igitur coronat Deus iustitiam quam eis gratis ipse tribuit, gratis servavit, gratisque perfecit" (*Ad Monim.,* I, 10, 13).

[99] *De verit. praedest.,* I, 7; cf. 1, 11, 14; II, 1; *Ad Monim.,* I, 13; cf. 7, 21, 26.

[100] *Ad Monim.,* I, 11–14, 24; *De verit. praedest.,* III, 1, 8–10.

[101] *Ad Monim.,* I, 10; III, 1, 3; *De verit. praedest.,* I, 11, 13; II, 1.

visa demerita. The number of the predestined is predetermined and unchangeable; no one who is predestined can be lost.[102] But, before decreeing *positive* reprobation, *i.e.,* the infliction of the pains that accompany the privation of the beatific vision, God considers the sins committed by the reprobate, and which are outside the plan of His providence: "Praedestinavit illos ad supplicium quos a se praescivit voluntatis malae vitio discessuros. . . . Praescivit enim hominum voluntates bonas et malas, praedestinavit autem non malas sed solas bonas." [103] God prompts no one to sin.

To emphasize his sentiments regarding the absolute character of predestination, Fulgentius, whose African temperament makes him far more ready than St. Prosper to adopt clear-cut formulas, declares that God does not will the salvation of all men. The subject is treated at length in the *De veritate praedestinationis,* III, 14–23. Fulgentius argues as follows: God's will is omnipotent; it is always fulfilled; hence, if not all men are saved, it is because God does not will it (14); and the proof that God does not will it, is that He does not give to all the grace of faith and charity. We read in the Gospel that Jesus spoke to some in parables, "ut verba sua vellet audiri, nec vellet intellegi" (15). "Et utique quibus suam denegat agnitionem denegat et salutem. In hoc enim homines salvi fiunt in quo ad agnitionem veritatis perveniunt. . . . Quomodo ergo erat voluntas Dei in iis salvandis quibus abscondebatur ipsa cognitio veritatis?" (16). "Quid est enim nolle mysterium suae cognitionis ostendere nisi salvare. Non ergo omnes homines vult salvos fieri" (18). Grace — either efficacious or sufficient, St. Fulgentius makes no distinction — is not given to all: "Non ergo putemus gratiam Dei omnibus

[102] *De verit. praedest.,* III, 6, 7.

[103] *Ad Monim.,* I, 2, 4, 5, 13, 21, 22, 23, 26; *De verit. praedest.,* I, 12.

hominibus dari. Non enim omnium est fides, et quidem caritatem Dei non recipiunt ut salvi fiant." [104] "De gratia vero non digne sentit quisquis eam putat omnibus hominibus dari, cum non solum non omnium sit fides, sed adhuc nonnullae gentes inveniantur ad quas fidei praedicatio non pervenit. . . . Non itaque gratia omnibus datur." [105]

But how are we to explain the *omnes homines vult salvos fieri* of *I Timothy,* II, 4? St. Fulgentius interprets this text just as St. Augustine had done. The word *omnes* must be understood of a certain number, it designates all those who are actually saved, or signifies that the predestined are taken "ex omni gente, conditione, aetate, lingua, ex omni provincia," or that all those who are saved, are saved only because God so wills.[106] The conclusion is plain: God does not will the salvation of all men.

What is true of men in general is true of children in particular. If some children die without baptism, it is not necessarily because grace has been denied them; it may be that some grace has been given them in their parents and that the latter have failed to coöperate with it; [107] but it is also true that at times the parents' earnest desire and good will are ineffective, because God does not assist them: "Nonne hic et pia parentum voluntas atque cursus ex Deo fuit, sed ideo non profuit, quia ut parvulus baptizaretur ex Deo non fuit?" [108] According to St. Fulgentius, who follows in the footsteps of St. Augustine, these infants are condemned "gehennali incendio," "igni aeterno," "interminabilibus ignis aeterni poenis." [109]

[104] *De verit. praedest.,* I, 42; II, 2.
[105] *Epist.* XV, 10.
[106] *De verit. praedest.,* III, 14, 15, 17–22; *Epist.* XV, 15; XVII, 61–66.
[107] *De verit. praedest.,* I, 18, 21.
[108] *De verit. praedest.,* I, 26.
[109] *De verit. praedest.,* I, 13, 31; III, 36; *Epist.* XVII, 28.

§ 4. St. Cæsarius and the Second Council of Orange.[110]

While St. Fulgentius was thus bending all his energies to crush the system of Faustus, the Bishop of Riez had been dead for many years.[111] But his ideas were still championed by a certain number of theologians, and the struggle between Augustinians and Semi-Pelagians in Gaul might have continued indefinitely, had there not arisen a man who succeeded in having both parties accept a solution which, whilst on the whole favoring the Augustinians, refrained from sanctioning their harshest assertions and ascribed to human liberty a legitimate share in the work of salvation. This man was St. Cæsarius, bishop of Arles.

Cæsarius had received his theological training partly at Lerins, and therefore knew the strong dislike there entertained for the ideas of St. Augustine. Having been brought to Arles about the year 496, and adopted into the clergy of Æonus about 498, he had, perhaps through the efforts of Julian Pomerius,[112] become thoroughly familiar with the Augustinian teaching. Recent discoveries make it certain that, whilst he did not countenance the extreme assertions of Augustinianism, Cæsarius did accept its spirit and main teachings.[113]

[110] Cf. below (p. 310, note 22), the bibliographic note regarding St. Cæsarius. The reader may consult, on the subject treated in these pages: A. Malnory, *Saint Césaire, évêque d'Arles,* Paris, 1894. C. F. Arnold, *Caesarius von Arelate,* Leipzig, 1894. P. Lejay, *Le rôle théologique de Césaire d'Arles,* II, *Le péché originel et la grâce,* in the *Revue d'hist. et de littér. religieuses,* X (1905), p. 217 and foll.

[111] He died after 485, but several years before 500.

[112] On Julian cfr. the notice of the continuator of Gennadius, *De scriptor. ecclesiast.,* 95.

[113] Cf. the opusculum edited by Dom Morin, *Revue bénédictine,* XIII (1896), p. 435 and foll., and Sermon XXII (*P. L.,* XXXIX, 1786). Similar traits are found in the other sermons. On the whole subject, cf. P. Lejay, *loc. cit.,* pp. 220–238.

These teachings, as we have remarked, were still opposed in Southern Gaul. In 527 or 528, there met at Valence a council chiefly of Burgundian bishops dependent on Vienne. All that we know about this Council comes to us from the biographer of St. Cæsarius;[114] but, taking what he says in connection with the reply of Pope Boniface to Cæsarius,[115] we can see that there were some opponents of the Bishop of Arles there, who were determined to secure the triumph of their views.[116] Cæsarius, who found himself unable to attend, warded off the blow by sending several delegates, among them Bishop Cyprian of Toulon, who presented a memoir in which Cæsarius, invoking the authority of Scripture, the holy Fathers, and the Popes, asserted "nihil per se in divinis profectibus quemquam arripere posse nisi fuerit primitus Dei gratia praeveniente vocatus. . . . Et quod tunc vere liberum homo resumat arbitrium, cum fuerit Christi liberatione redemptus."[117]

The danger was averted, at least for the time being. In order to forestall its recurrence, Cæsarius turned to the Pope — then Felix IV — whose vicar he was in the transalpine territories, and sent him for approval the nineteen *Capitula sancti Augustini in urbe Romae transmissa*.[118] The Pope returned this document, after having altered it considerably. Of the nineteen *capitula* eight only were left; the others, and particularly numbers XI–XIV, referring to predestination and reprobation, had been set aside. On the other

[114] I, 46 (*P. L.*, LXVII, 1023).

[115] *Epist.* I, *P. L.*, XLV, 1790.

[116] This is the common explanation. Some critics place the Council of Valence after that of Orange.

[117] *S. Caesarii vita*, I, 46.

[118] Mansi, VIII, 722–724. I follow M. Lejay, *loc. cit.*, p. 250 and foll. A Namur MS. has ten other *capitula* (Pitra, *Analecta sacra*, V, 161, 162), but Dom Morin thinks these were subsequently added by Cæsarius to develop his ideas.

hand, sixteen new propositions, taken from the *Sententiae* extracted from St. Augustine's writings by St. Prosper, had been added.[119] Cæsarius introduced still another,[120] revised those which he had received back from Rome, drew up a sort of conclusion in the shape of a profession of faith, and submitted the whole thing to the bishops gathered at Orange, July 3, 529.

Including Cæsarius, there were but fourteen of these bishops, who had come for the consecration of a basilica; but, as a result of the papal confirmation, their decisions soon obtained almost as great an authority as that of the most important councils. The substance of these decisions is as follows:[121]

1. Through the sin of Adam, man has been "secundum corpus et animam in deterius commutatus."

2. By sinning Adam injured not only himself, but all his posterity, to which he transmitted both the death of the body, which is the punishment of sin, and also sin, "quod mors est animae."

3. Grace is not granted to prayer; but it is by grace that we are led to pray.[122]

4. God does not wait until we wish to be cleansed from sin; it is the Holy Ghost who produces this desire in us.

5. As the growth of faith, so also the *initium fidei* and the *ipse credulitatis affectus* do not come from nature, but are the work of grace.

6. Mercy is not granted by God to those who, without

[119] *P. L.*, XLV, 1861, or LI, 427. They are sentences 22, 54, 56, 152, 212, 226, 260, 297, 299, 310, 314, 317, 325, 340, 368, 372.

[120] It is number X in the definitions of the Council of Orange.

[121] Cf. the text in *P. L.*, XLV, 1785; MANSI, VIII, 712; HAHN, *Biblioth.*, § 174; HEFELE-LECLERCQ, *Hist. des conciles*, II, 2, p. 1093. (*History of the Councils*, vol. IV, p. 155 and foll.).

[122] In other words, prayer does not precede grace, but there is a first grace that precedes prayer.

grace, believe, will, desire, strive, work, watch, apply themselves, ask, seek and knock; but it is the Holy Ghost who makes us believe, will, etc., in the right way. Likewise, the *adiutorium gratiae* does not come as an addition to man's humility and obedience, but obedience and humility are themselves a grace of God.

7. "Si quis per naturae vigorem bonum aliquid quod ad salutem pertinet vitae aeternae cogitare ut expedit, aut eligere, sive salutari, id est evangelicae praedicationi consentire posse confirmat absque illustratione et inspiratione Spiritus sancti . . . haeretico fallitur spiritu."

8. It is false to say that some come to baptism "misericordiâ," and others "per liberum arbitrium"; for this is tantamount to affirming that free-will has not been depraved in all, or at least has not been wounded to such a degree that some can, *sine revelatione Dei* and *per seipsos,* seek the mystery of salvation. (In other words, free-will has been wounded in all men to such a degree that not even some can, *sine revelatione Dei* and *per seipsos,* seek the mystery of salvation.)

9. "Divini est muneris cum et recte cogitamus et pedes nostros a falsitate et iniustitia continemus; quoties enim bona agimus, Deus in nobis atque nobiscum ut operemur operatur."

10. "Adiutorium Dei etiam renatis ac sanctis semper est implorandum, ut ad finem bonum pervenire vel in bono possint opere perdurare."

11. "Nemo quidquam Domino recte voverit, nisi ab ipso acceperit quod voveret."

12. "Tales nos amat Deus quales futuri sumus ipsius dono, non quales sumus nostro merito."

13. "Arbitrium voluntatis in primo homine infirmatum nisi per gratiam baptismi non potest reparari: quod amissum nisi a quo potuit dari non potest reddi."

14. "Nullus miser de quacumque miseria liberatur, nisi qui Dei misericordia praevenitur."

15. Through his sin, Adam was changed for the worse; the Christian is changed for the better through grace; this is "mutatio dexterae Excelsi."

16. Let no one glory in what he has, as though he had not received it, or believe that he has received it because he has read or heard externally the divine word; what we have, we have received from the grace of Jesus Christ.

17. "Fortitudinem gentium mundana cupiditas, fortitudinem autem christianorum Dei caritas facit, quae diffusa est in cordibus nostris non per voluntatis arbitrium quod est a nobis, sed per Spiritum sanctum qui datus est nobis."

18. "Nullis meritis gratiam praevenientibus, debetur merces bonis operibus si fiant; sed gratia, quae non debetur, praecedit ut fiant."

19. Even though human nature were in the state of integrity, in which it was created, it could not preserve itself without divine help; much less can it, without that help, regain what it has lost.

20. "Multa Deus facit in homine bona quae non facit homo: nulla vero facit homo bona quae non Deus praestat ut faciat homo."

21. Just as Christ would have died in vain, if the Law had justified sinners, so His death would have been useless, were grace identical with nature; but Jesus Christ died to fulfil the Law and to restore ruined nature.

22. "Nemo habet de suo nisi mendacium et peccatum." What man possesses of truth and righteousness, he has from God.

23. "Suam voluntatem homines faciunt, non Dei, quando id agunt quod Deo displicet; quando autem id faciunt quod volunt, ut divinae serviant voluntati, quamvis volentes agant

quod agunt, illius tamen voluntas est a quo et praeparatur et iubetur quod volunt."

24. The faithful live in Christ like the branch in the vine; hence it is of advantage to them that they abide in Christ, and He in them.

25. "Prorsus donum est diligere Deum. Ipse ut diligeretur dedit qui non dilectus diligit. Displicentes amati sumus, ut fieret in nobis unde placeremus."

The profession of faith that followed these *capitula*, emphasized their main points, especially the necessity of grace for the beginning of every good work, and added that all those who are baptized, "Christo auxiliante et cooperante," can and must, "si fideliter laborare voluerint, quae ad salutem pertinent adimplere." Then: "Aliquos vero ad malum divina potestate praedestinatos esse non solum non credimus, sed etiam si sunt, qui tantum malum credere velint, cum omni detestatione illis anathema dicimus."

After the signatures had been obtained, Cæsarius applied himself to obtaining the papal confirmation of all that had been done and decreed at Arles, and turned again to Rome. Meanwhile Felix IV had died, and it was his successor, Boniface II, who, on January 25, 531, answered the Bishop of Arles.[123] In his reply, the Pope approves the decisions of the synod and declares its profession of faith "consentanea catholicis Patrum regulis."[124] He expresses the hope that, through his learning and zeal, Cæsarius may succeed in bringing back to the truth those who had been led into error.

This hope was not frustrated and, gradually, peace prevailed in Gaul as regards these vexatious questions. The theologians accepted the teachings of Cæsarius and his coun-

[123] *Epist.* I, *P. L.*, XLV, 1790 and LXV, 31.

[124] The Pope's approval seems to refer particularly to the profession of faith.

cil. Whilst sanctioning the doctrine of the inability of the unaided will to do good,[125] and of the necessity of prevenient grace even for the beginning of faith and the work of salvation, these teachings make no reference to those Augustinian assertions that were the most vulnerable and the most fiercely contested on both sides. Nothing was said on the intrinsic malice of concupiscence; on its agency in the transmission of original sin; on the *massa damnata;* on the lot of unbaptized children; on the nature of grace and its irresistibility; on the twofold delectation and the way in which we are carried away by the one or the other; on the small number of the elect and God's will to save all men. Nothing is said of predestination, except to condemn those who assert that God predestines men to sin and evil. On the other hand, the Council affirms that, by joining their efforts to God's grace, all those who are baptized, can and must fulfil their duties. This was equivalent to declaring that grace is never wanting to Christians, and that it does not accomplish everything in them.

Thus, whilst adopting the substance of St. Augustine's views regarding the divine action in man and the economy of salvation, the Church did not sanction all his speculations. No doubt, at the end of those protracted controversies, which had lasted more than a century, St. Augustine remained the victor. Pelagius had taught that man, through the energy of his will and the exertions of his nature, is the cause of his own salvation and that God intervened merely to make it easier for him to reach heaven. This meant the confusion of two distinct orders, the natural and the supernatural. Against this error St. Augustine had proclaimed God as the

[125] This is the most specifically Augustinian feature of the declarations of the Council. Cf. *capitula* 9, 17, 20, and especially 22, which repeat sentences 22, 297, 314 and 325 of St. Prosper. *Capitulum* 22 has given rise to many discussions.

real and the chief cause of our salvation. By original sin, he said, man has been reduced to such a state of helplessness that he cannot by himself accomplish anything good; God must then predestine him gratuitously, prevent, raise and sustain him, and carry him, as it were, into heaven. According to Pelagius, supernatural works were wrought by nature; according to St. Augustine, there were no merely natural good works; nature indeed supplied one of the conditions for salvation, *i.e.*, the effort of the will under the action of grace; but grace worked with nature and permeated all its actions.

Now, some thought that the Bishop of Hippo had overrated man's disability, and that his theory of absolute predestination made God responsible for the lot of the reprobates. But these critics also confused the natural and the supernatural orders[126] in teaching, as they did, that free-will, which has been wounded but not destroyed, can, without grace, accomplish some good, not only in the moral order, but even in the supernatural and divine order. This was a revival of Pelagianism, and the name of Semi-Pelagianism, although comparatively recent, accurately describes the views of Cassian and Faustus. Their error was correctly sized up and justly condemned by Prosper, Fulgentius, Cæsarius, and the Council of Orange. These taught that nature and free-will, left to themselves, are incapable of accomplishing and even of beginning the supernatural work of salvation, and that God is the primary and necessary agent who creates in us the first desire of good and brings about its effective accomplishment. Unquestionably, St. Augustine, on the whole, came out victorious. He is the doctor of grace, and the substance of his teaching has become the Church's. However, the efforts of his opponents have

[126] This confusion is clearly noted by Pope Boniface II, *Epist.* I, 3.

not been useless. By upholding the claims of nature, they forestalled the official adoption of his too rigorous conclusions and thereby aided in preserving the humane character of the Church's teaching.

CHAPTER IX

LATIN THEOLOGY FROM THE DEATH OF ST. AUGUSTINE (430) TO THE BEGINNING OF CHARLEMAGNE'S REIGN (771)

§ 1. Historical and Patristic Survey.

Up to the 5th century, Latin theology had developed only within the boundaries of the Western Roman Empire. But the time had come when that empire also was to disappear, and new kingdoms were to be carved out of its remains. When St. Augustine lay dying at Hippo, that city was besieged by the Vandals. Nine years afterwards, in 439, the invaders seized Carthage and became the masters of Africa. True, a hundred years later, in 534, Belisarius wrested it from them; but, as early as 640, the Arabs invaded Egypt and threatened Cyrenaica. In 698, Carthage fell definitively under their dominion. This was the deathblow of Byzantine rule in Africa, and almost marked the end of the Christian Church there.

The Vandals had passed over to Africa from Spain, where, together with the Suevi and the Alani, they had arrived as early as 409. Afterwards the Visigoths came (414), and the country was divided between these conquerors. Then, gradually, unity prevailed, with the Visigoths on top. In the year 585, it was perfected by Leovigild, the father of Hermenegild and Recared. However, the new kingdom lasted but a hundred and twenty-five years. In 711, the Arabs, under the command of Tarik, crossed the sea and conquered the whole of Spain. A handful of patriots took refuge in the mountains of the Asturias, and there with pa-

tient fortitude began the work of their country's liberation from Islamism.

Gaul was subject to similar vicissitudes. In 413, the Burgundians founded the kingdom of Burgundy in the upper part of the valley of the Rhone, whilst the Visigoths settled in the Southwest, between the Loire and the Pyrenees. In the North the Franks advanced as far as the banks of the Somme (428). Clovis conquered successively the central provinces still subject to the Romans (486), Aquitaine, except Septimania (which remained in the hands of the Visigoths), and Burgundy, which became tributary (500).[1] In the Northwest, the Armorican cities bowed to his authority.[2] However, the unity lasted but a few years. Although it was restored under Clotaire I (558–561), and under Clotaire II (613–628), it was dissolved again and again by the division of the territory among the children of the various kings and the intestine wars which the heirs waged against one another. As a result of these dissensions, the dynasty of the Merovingians became exhausted and disappeared altogether, in 752, to make room for Pepin the Short and the Carolingians.

In Great Britain, the imperial authority had practically come to an end as early as the first quarter of the 5th century, when the Roman legions had returned to the continent (426). Left to themselves, the native Britons were not able to resist the invasions of the Saxons (453) and the Angli (547), which resulted in the formation of the Saxon Heptarchy (584), *i.e.*, a confederacy of seven kingdoms founded by the invaders.

As to the provinces situated in the north and east of Italy, and along the Danube, their subjection to the Em-

[1] Burgundy became a part of the Frankish kingdom in 534.

[2] Only for a while, however, for they struggled long and hard to maintain their independence.

peror was nominal only and became so more and more. After coming into the possession of the Goths, Huns, and Vandals, these provinces were included in the kingdom of the Ostrogoths and of Theodoric in the year 493.

There remain Italy and Rome, the heart of that vast organism. As early as 402, Ravenna had become the real capital of the imperial possessions in the West. Rome was taken first by Alaric and his Visigoths, in 410, and again, in 455, by Genseric and his Huns. In the midst of an incredible turmoil and many struggles, the Roman empire of the West went down to ruin, under the repeated blows of the barbarians, who for over a century were the only ones to support it, and had merely to turn against it in order to destroy it. In the year 476, Odoacer, king of the Heruli, was proclaimed king of Italy. His reign lasted seventeen years. As early as 493, Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths, conquered and killed Odoacer and seized the royal power. Under his intelligent and vigorous administration, security at last prevailed. But his successors were unable to preserve the fruits of his victories. Italy was conquered by Belisarius and Narses, Justinian's lieutenants, and the year 553 witnessed the end of the Ostrogoth kingdom and the re-establishment of the Byzantine imperial rule in Italy. The Byzantine power was reduced to the exarchate of Ravenna (Rome, Naples, and Sicily) by the Lombard invasion of Upper Italy (568). In 752, the Lombard king Astolphus seized the exarchate and threatened Rome. Against him and his successor Didier, the Popes invoked the help of Pepin and later of Charlemagne. In 774, the Lombard kingdom came to an end, and Charles was proclaimed king of Lombardy and "patritius" of Rome; some twenty-five years later (800), he was crowned emperor of the West.

This brief account does not convey even a slight idea of the convulsions that shook the countries occupied by the

Latin Church during the period which we are considering. In the midst of these convulsions, the faith was preserved, nay extended, in spite of the invading heathens and Arian heretics; religious unity continued to hold together the various members of that large family which the barbarians divided among themselves. But it is easy to see that serene contemplation and pure speculation cannot thrive in times such as these. In proportion as the work of destruction progressed, Christian teachers felt greater need of summing up in simple and practical formulas, and of adapting to the new generations, the teachings elaborated by the Fathers and theologians of preceding ages. The substance of these formulas is generally borrowed from St. Augustine, who had himself summed up the tradition of the first four centuries and now supplied the elements of the tradition of subsequent ages, which did not, however, inherit his genius nor the fulness of his doctrinal views. The Augustinianism of St. Cæsarius, St. Gregory, and St. Isidore is a curtailed Augustinianism, such as can be grasped by ordinary minds. Yet, it is owing to them that the best religious thought of the past was preserved and handed down, until, in the Middle Ages, a revival took place, which gave theology a new impetus.

It would take us too far afield to review the many writers who succeeded one another in the Latin Church from the death of St. Augustine till the beginning of the rule of Charlemagne. We can only give the principal names. At Rome, two Popes admirably personify the Roman genius — St. Leo (440–461)[3] and St. Gregory (590–604).[4] Both

[3] St. Leo is quoted here according to the Ballerini edition, reproduced in the Latin Patrology, vol. LIV–LVI.— Studies: Ed. Perthel, *Pabst Leo's I Leben und Lehren,* Jena, 1843. Ph. Kuhn, *Die Christologie Leo's I des Grossen,* Würzburg, 1894.

[4] Works in *P. L.,* LXXV–LXXIX.— Studies: J. Th. Lau, *Gregor I der Grosse nach seinem Leben und seiner Lehre geschildert,* Leipzig,

have received the title of Great; both deserve it by their strong character, their devotion to the welfare of Church and State, and the wisdom and consummate skill with which they ruled the faithful. They are theologians by birth and temperament, gifted with that sense of proportion which sets aside trifling questions and discards extreme solutions. St. Leo is the more original of the two. Called upon to decide the Christological disputes that divided the East, he shows that he has deeply pondered the mystery of the Incarnation, and draws luminous consequences therefrom for his moral teaching. His literary style is one of the noblest that Christian Rome has ever known.

Compared with the magnificent diction of his great predecessor, that of Pope St. Gregory I seems tame. His theological doctrine is also, on the whole, less spirited and refined. Gregory has acquired it from a perusal of the works of St. Augustine, but he adapts it to the mediocrity of his time and to the predominantly practical character of religion in his day. St. Gregory has often been reproached with the credulity he displays, especially in his *Dialogues*. In truth, I think, we must see in that rather peculiar work the pastime of one who, in order to obtain some relief from his exalted position and the sorrows that encompass him on all sides, seeks and finds diversion in wonders which it never occurs to him to question. It is mainly by his letters that we must estimate the intelligence and character of this great Pontiff; and his letters are in every way admirable.

St. Peter Chrysologus (+ about 450)[5] and St. Maximus

1845. H. Grisar, *Der römische Primat nach der Lehre und der Regierungs-Praxis Gregors des Grossen*, in *Zeitschrift für kathol. Theol.*, III, 1879, 655–693. Snow, *St. Gregory the Great, his Work and his Spirit*, London, 1892. F. H. Dudden, *Gregory the Great, his Place in History and Thought*, London, 1905. T. Tarducci, *Storia di Gregorio Magno e del suo tempo*, Roma, 1909.

[5] Works in *P. L.*, LII.— Studies: H. Dapper, *Der heil. Petrus*

of Turin (+ about 470),[6] were contemporaries of St. Leo. Both have left sermons that have not yet been definitively edited and present but a secondary importance from the viewpoint of the history of dogma. This is not the case with the writings of Theodoric's ill-fated minister, Boethius (about 480–525),[7] whose philosophical works served to initiate the mediæval scholars into the knowledge of Aristotle and Porphyry, while his brief theological treatises embody a painstaking attempt to prove and express in philosophical language the chief mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation. The *De consolatione philosophiae,* the best known of his writings, is a work of religious philosophy which may be regarded as a sort of apologia of divine Providence and is in fact, though not ostensibly, based on Christian principles. Some have wrongly seen in it the work of a pagan.

Whilst Boethius is above all a theorist, his friend Cassiodorus (about 447–570),[8] also a minister of Theodoric, is a practical thinker. On retiring from worldly pursuits, about the year 540, his ambition was to found a school of theology for the West, which was much needed. Unable to carry out his purpose, he at least supplied in his *Institutiones divinarum et saecularium lectionum* a guide for the acquisition of divine and human knowledge, and labored to develop

Chrysologus, der erste Erzbischof von Ravenna, Köln-Neuss, 1867. Fl. v. Stablewski, *Der hl. Kirchenv. Petrus von Ravenna Chrysologus,* Posen, 1871.

[6] Works in *P. L.,* LVII.

[7] Works in *P. L.,* LXIII, LXIV.— Studies: L. C. Bourquard, *De A. M. Severino Boethio, christiano viro,* Andegavi, 1877. A. Hildebrand, *Boëthius und seine Stellung zum Christenthum,* Regensburg, 1885. H. F. Stewart, *Boethius, an Essay,* London, 1892.

[8] Works in *P. L.,* LXIX, LXX.— Studies: A. Franz, *M. Aurelius Cassiodorus Senator, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der theol. Literatur,* Breslau, 1872. G. Minasi, *M. A. Cassiodoro Senatore,* Napoli, 1895.

a taste for study in the monasteries. Very few men have deserved as well of letters and civilization as Cassiodorus.

We have already named St. Fulgentius (bishop in 507 or 508, + 533),[9] whom Bossuet styled "the greatest theologian of his time." Fulgentius is indeed a clear-headed, exact, and forcible writer, who skilfully unravels the manifold difficulties submitted to him, and usually finds the answer in St. Augustine. Hence, he lacks originality, as a rule, though he is not a mere plagiarist, but has assimilated his master's teaching and reproduces it as something that he has made his own by personal reflection and study. By his side we find a deacon of Carthage, Ferrandus, who was very much consulted by his contemporaries, but whose only extant works are a few letters and a canonical compilation.[10]

St. Fulgentius did not confine himself to questions concerning grace; he took up Christology when he was consulted by the Scythian monks, and later, to refute the Arian Vandals, dealt also with the Trinitarian problem. On this last battlefield he seems to have had numerous supporters, judging from the great many African writings of that period which were directed against Arianism and the authors of which it is at times difficult to ascertain. We know that Vigilius, bishop of Tapsus, who died shortly after 520, composed several writings of this kind, of which one at least is still extant.[11] Likewise, we possess a short treatise of Cerealis, bishop of Castellum (about 484) against Maximinus,[12] the Arian. The controversy of the Three Chapters, in which the Africans as a whole took sides against

[9] Works in *P. L.*, LXV.— Studies: A. Mally, *Das Leben des hl. Fulgentius*, Wien, 1885.

[10] *P. L.*, LXVII.

[11] Works in *P. L.*, LXII.— Studies: G. Ficker, *Studien zu Vigilius von Thapsus*, Leipzig, 1897.

[12] *P. L.*, LVIII.

Pope and Emperor, also occasioned numerous writings. We know, among others, the extensive treatise of Facundus of Hermiane, *Pro defensione trium capitulorum* (546–548), his *Liber contra Mocianum* and his *Epistula fidei;*[13] the *Excerptiones de gestis chalcedonensis concilii* of Verecundus of Junca (+ about 552),[14] and the (mostly historical) *Breviarium* of the deacon Liberatus of Carthage (560–566).[15]

Turning from Africa to Gaul, we notice that theological activity seems to be concentrated around Lerins, Marseilles, and Vienne[16] in the South. At Marseilles and Lerins originates the reaction against the Augustinian teaching of grace and predestination; which does not mean that the genius and work of St. Augustine are not held in high esteem there; but, however faithfully the theologians of Southern Gaul follow him in his other teachings, they feel bound in conscience to depart from him on this particular point. Cassian,[17] the moralist Salvian,[18] and the priest Gennadius (end of the 5th century)[19] belong to the school of Marseilles. The author of the famous *Commonitorium* (434), St. Vincent,[20] belongs to that of Lerins, and from Lerins also hailed Honoratus and Hilary of Arles, Eucherius of Lyons, whose writings are partly lost and partly do not concern our subject, Faustus of Riez, who was still living at the end of the

[13] *P. L.*, LXVII.

[14] Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesmense*, IV, Paris, 1858.

[15] *P. L.*, LXVIII.

[16] Regarding St. Prosper, cf. above, p. 269 sqq.

[17] Works in *P. L.*, XLIX, L. Cf. above, p. 266, the studies referred to.

[18] Works in *P. L.*, LIII.

[19] Works in *P. L.*, LVIII.

[20] *P. L.*, L.— Studies: A. Louis, *Etude sur saint Vincent de Lérins et ses ouvrages*, in the *Revue du Clergé français*, II, 1895. R. Poirel, *De utroque Commonitorio lirinensi*, Nanceii, 1896. P. de Labriolle, *Saint Vincent de Lérins* (Pensée chrétienne), Paris, 1906.

5th century,[21] and his opponent, Cæsarius of Arles (+ 543).[22] Cæsarius, one of the ablest and most popular orators of the ancient Latin Church, best represents the practical and regulating character of that Church. He makes use of the most abstract dogmas for the direction of souls; he is fond of formulas that define and condense a doctrine, distinctions that tend to make thought more precise, and classifications that introduce some of the ways of legal procedure into the problems of ethics. Living in the midst of barbarians and realizing that classical culture is coming to an end and will soon be forgotten, he is anxious to transmit to the people who surround him at least a few simple rules of faith and conduct. Unfortunately, the authenticity of his works has suffered considerably from his popularity, and so many have borrowed from him that it is difficult to restore to him all that is truly his own.

Faustus found an opponent of his teaching regarding the soul in Claudian Mamertus, a priest of Vienne (+ about 474).[23] A few years later, the illustrious bishop of that city, St. Avitus (bishop about 490, + 526)[24] won distinction

[21] Cf. above, p. 282, the editions and works referred to.

[22] There is no complete edition of his works. The *Latin Patrology*, vol. LXVII and vol. XXXIX (among the apocryphal sermons of St. Augustine), contains some of them. Others have been published by Dom Morin in the *Revue bénédictine*. On this bibliographical question, cf. P. Lejay, *Notes bibliographiques sur Césaire d'Arles*, in the *Revue d'hist. et de littér. relig.*, X (1905), p. 183–188.— Studies: A. Malnory, *Saint Césaire, évêque d'Arles*, Paris, 1894. C. F. Arnold, *Caesarius von Arelate*, Leipzig, 1894. P. Lejay, *Le rôle théologique de Césaire d'Arles* in the *Revue* quoted, X (1905), p. 135, 217, 444, 579.

[23] Works in *P. L.*, LIII.— Studies: M. Schulze, *Die Schrift des Claudianus Mamertus . . . über das Wesen der Seele*, Dresden, 1883. R. de la Broise, *Mamerti Claudiani vita eiusque doctrina de anima hominis*, Paris, 1890.

[24] Edit. Ulysse Chevalier, *Œuvres complètes de saint Avit, év. de Vienne*, Lyon, 1890.— Studies: A. Charaux, *Saint Avite, évêque de Vienne, en Dauphiné*, Paris, 1876. H. Denzinger, *Alc. Ecdic. Avitus*,

as a poet and also wrote in prose against the Eutychians and the Arians.

In Spain, theological literature, which had for many years been dimmed by wars, shone again with new luster at the end of the 6th and during the 7th century. St. Martin of Braga (+ 580) is chiefly a moralist, but he also wrote a small treatise on the rite of baptism.[25] The great Spanish doctor is St. Isidore of Seville (bishop about 600, + 636),[26] who has been eulogized by councils as equal to the most illustrious Fathers of the Church, and who truly deserves that praise on account of his extensive erudition and literary fecundity. In his encyclopædic writings he has endeavored to condense all knowledge, divine and human, and to bequeath to the Middle Ages a repertory of the sciences. Of course, this is more a work of compilation than of personal reflection. The substance of his theology he borrowed from St. Gregory and St. Augustine.

St. Ildefonsus, bishop of Toledo (bishop 659–667),[27] has left an important treatise, *De cognitione baptismi,* which, according to some critics, reproduces, in substance, a lost treatise on the same subject by Bishop Justinian of Valence, who died after 546. Another bishop of Toledo, St. Julian (bishop 680–690),[28] equaled St. Isidore, if he did not sur-

archev. de Vienne, Genève, 1890. P. N. Frantz, *Avitus von Vienne,* Greifswald, 1908.

[25] This treatise, *De trina mersione,* may be found in Florez, *España sagrada,* XV.

[26] Works in *P. L.,* LXXXI–LXXXIV.— Studies: E. D'Ault-Dumesnil, *Etudes sur la vie, les oeuvres et le temps de s. Isidore de Séville,* in the *Université catholique,* vol. XVI, 1843. M. Menandez Pelayo, *Saint Isidore et l'importance de son rôle dans l'histoire intellectuelle de l'Espagne,* French transl. in the *Annales de philosophie chrétienne,* vol. VII, 1882, p. 258–269.

[27] Works in *P. L.,* XCVI.

[28] Works in *P. L.,* XCVI.— Studies: R. Hanow, *De Iuliano toletano,* Icnae, 1891. P. A. Wengen, *Iulianus, Erzbischof von Toledo,* St. Gallen, 1891.

pass him, in originality. The son of Jewish parents, Julian was historian, theologian, and controversialist, churchman and statesman all in one person, and his talent shed luster on the last days of the Visigothic rule.

We shall close this brief patristic sketch with the name of St. Bede (672–735).[29] Bede did for England what Isidore did for Spain; he strove to transmit to the English Church a summary of the sciences that were then known, and especially the quintessence of the ecclesiastical writers who had preceded him. Whilst he shows freedom and originality in his history of the Church in England, he closely follows his predecessors when it comes to doctrinal and theological subjects. This is probably due to conscious modesty and prudent reserve and shows humility rather than inability.

Lack of individuality is the main feature of the writers with whom we are now concerned, especially about the end of this period. They think that, after the leaders of genius who have preceded them, they can neither renew nor improve on the work of doctrinal exposition, and hence confine themselves to classifying, codifying, and giving solutions and explanations; they hold councils in order to reform the lives of the people, but their treatment of dogmatic subjects is rather superficial. When we recall the character of the times in which they lived, we can hardly wonder at this. During those ages and in those circumstances, it was no small merit to preserve the traditions of the past and inculcate the rudiments of religious doctrine in the unruly neophytes who were then entering the Church.

[29] Works in *P. L.*, XC–XCV.— Studies: K. Werner, *Beda der Ehrwürdige und seine Zeit*, Wien, 2d edit., 1881. B. Plaine, *Le vénérable Bède, docteur de l'Eglise*, in the *Revue anglo-romaine*, III, 1896, pp. 46–96.

§ 2. **The Sources of Faith. Scripture. Tradition. Philosophy.**

After asking himself to what authorities a Christian must have recourse, in order to prove his faith and discern truth from falsehood, St. Vincent of Lerins mentions first Holy Writ and then Catholic tradition: "primum scilicet divinae legis auctoritate, tum deinde Ecclesiae catholicae traditione." [30] St. Fulgentius answers the Scythian monks that, on the subjects that have been submitted to him, he is going to tell them just what he has learned "canonicorum sancta auctoritate voluminum, paternorum quoque dictorum doctrina atque institutione." [31]

There are, then, two sources of Catholic truth. The first is Scripture,— the "canonical books," in the words of St. Fulgentius. The list of these canonical books was fixed by the Latin Church as early as the end of the 4th century. A Roman council held under Damasus, probably in the year 382, drew up a list that differs but slightly from ours.[32] The same list is found in the fortieth canon of a council of Hippo, A. D. 393,[33] and in the letter of Innocent I to St. Exuperius of Toulouse.[34] These books have God for their author: "Quid est autem Scriptura sacra," St. Gregory asks, "nisi quaedam epistula omnipotentis Dei ad creaturam suam?" [35] The Holy Ghost has dictated and therefore composed them.[36] Filled with Him, and prompted and di-

[30] *Commonitor.*, 2.

[31] *Epist.* XVII, 1.

[32] This is the canon contained in the famous so-called Gelasian decree, *De libris recipiendis*, *P. L.*, LIX, 157–180.

[33] Mansi, III, 924; cf. Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des conciles*, II, 1, p. 89 (*History of the Councils*, vol. II, p. 400).

[34] *Epist.* VI, 13 (*P. L.*, XX, 501). In his *De cognitione baptismi*, LXXVIII, St. Ildefonsus of Toledo gives a certain number of practical rules bearing on the books whose canonicity is disputed.

[35] *Epist.* IV, 31, col. 706.

[36] St. Gregory, *Moral.*, Praef., 2.

rected by Him, the human authors were, so to speak, enraptured and carried beyond themselves, so that they might have spoken of their own personality as that of another.[37]

Sacred Scripture is susceptible of various senses, which do not exclude one another. Like St. Jerome, our authors either follow St. Gregory,[38] and distinguish a *literal* sense, a *typical* (*i.e.*, doctrinal) sense, and lastly a *moral* sense, that refers to moral conduct; or, like Cassian,[39] an *historical* and a *spiritual* sense, the latter being divided into an *allegorical, anagogical* (which refers to the mysteries of God and the future life), and *tropological* or *moral* sense. Our readers know with what particular fondness St. Gregory and his imitators developed the last-mentioned sense. However, the author of the *Moralia* is well aware that, whilst interpreting Scripture in the spiritual sense, it will not do to make light of the historical sense: "Hoc tamen magnopere petimus ut qui ad spiritalem intellegentiam mentem sublevat a veneratione historiae non recedat." [40]

From a doctrinal standpoint, Holy Writ must be regarded as the prime authority laid down by God in His Church; it is the word of God and therefore infallible.[41] Hence, considered in itself, it ought to suffice to clear up all difficulties and settle all controversies. But on account of its depth, men find difficulty in interpreting it properly, and every one explains it in his own way. Hence there must be some standard to guide interpretation and determine the sense in which Scripture is to be understood. This standard is the ecclesiastical and Catholic teaching, Catholic dogma, the tradition

[37] *Ibid.*, 3.
[38] *Moral.*, Praef., 4; *In Ezech.*, I, homil. VII, 10; homil. IX, 30.
[39] *Collat.* XIV, 8.
[40] *Moral.*, II, 56; *In evang. homil.* XL, 1.
[41] St. Prosper, *Exposit. in psalm.* CIII, v. 2; St. Maximus of Turin: "In Scripturis sanctis et honestatis doctrina est et correptio delictorum et eruditio veritatis" (*Sermo* CX, col. 749).

of the universal Church, " propheticae et apostolicae interpretationis linea secundum ecclesiastici et catholici sensus formam dirigatur. . . . Divinum canonem secundum universalis Ecclesiae traditiones, et iuxta catholici dogmatis regulas interpretentur." [42]

In thus making biblical exegesis dependent upon tradition and the teaching of the Church, the authors of whom we are treating show plainly that, for them, Holy Writ is not the only and ultimate source of faith, nor a supreme judge that settles all the doctrinal disputes which arise among Christians. As a matter of fact, there are, in the history of theology, very few periods in which the authority of *tradition* was invoked as frequently as in the period we are now considering. St. Leo still uses this word in its primitive sense of teaching and custom transmitted by word of mouth or by practice. He asserts that " quidquid ab Ecclesia in consuetudinem est devotionis receptum " proceeds " de traditione apostolica et de sancti Spiritus doctrina." For instance, the custom of taking collections, of ordaining on Sunday and baptizing at Easter, are Apostolic traditions.[43] But soon tradition became more and more identified with the teaching of the Church and with the sum-total of the truths proposed to the faithful for their belief by the ecclesiastical magisterium. We have seen this idea in St. Vincent of Lerins.[44] Cassiodorus writes that heresies have arisen because " contraria matri [Ecclesiae] dogmata sunt secuti . . . ab eius sanctis traditionibus erraverunt." [45] What still remains for us to say will illustrate that same attitude towards the authority of the Church.

The most frequently quoted organ of the Church's teach-

[42] Vinc. Lir., *Commonit.*, 2, 27, 29; Cassian, *De incarn.*, V, 5.
[43] *Sermo* LXXIX, 1; VIII; *Epist.* IX, 1; XVI, 1; CLXVIII, 1.
[44] Cf. also *Commonitor.*, 9.
[45] *In psalm.* LVII, 3.

ing and doctrinal tradition are the *Fathers.* As has been said above, this title was first used in the 5th century to designate those teachers and ecclesiastical writers who enjoyed exceptional authority. At the time of which we are speaking, in the West even more than in the East, these writers are regarded as the teachers of religious truth, and their testimony is quoted as authoritative: "Plebs Dei noverit," writes St. Leo, "ea sibi praesenti doctrina insinuari quae Patres et acceperunt a pracedentibus suis et posteribus tradiderunt"; [46] and St. Fulgentius: "Dignum itaque est . . . ut in singulis quibusque sententiis in quibus nubilo cuiusquam obscuritatis ambigimus, sanctorum Patrum definitionibus haereamus." [47] St. Cæsarius again and again mentions the Fathers, the holy Fathers, the holy and ancient Fathers; [48] and one of the most striking instances that illustrate this attitude of mind is the formula with which the Lateran Council, held under Martin I in the year 649, begins every one of its first eleven canons: "Si quis, secundum sanctos Patres, non confitetur . . . etc. . . ." [49] Appeals to the authority of the Fathers became an accepted practice among Latin theologians. Hence in the West as well as in the East, in order to support the theses which they hope will ultimately conquer, some compose collections of patristic texts that pass from one author to the other, and form, as it were, an arsenal open to all. St. Leo adds a collection of this kind to his celebrated letter to Flavian, in 449; [50] he repeats and even increases it in a letter to the

[46] *Epist.* CXXIX, 2; XCIV.

[47] *De veritate praedest.*, I, 33; *Epist.* XVII, 1; cf. Cassiodorus, *De institutione divin. litter.*, XV, col. 1130.

[48] Cf. Dom G. Morin, *Revue Bénédictine*, vol. XXI (1904), p. 237.

[49] Hahn, *Biblioth.*, § 181.

[50] Cf. L. Saltet, *Les sources de l'Eranistes de Théodoret*, in the *Revue d'hist. ecclésiast.*, VI, 1905, p. 290 and foll.

Emperor Leo, in 458.[51] Pope Martin has another such collection read in the council of 649, against the Monothelites.[52]

Not all the ecclesiastical writers, however, were reckoned among the "Fathers." The pseudo-Gelasian decree *De libris recipiendis* [53] is not merely concerned with those books of the Bible that must be accepted or rejected, but gives a selection from ecclesiastical writers, and distinguishes those whom the Church approves and receives from those whom she rejects.[54] St. Vincent of Lerins observes that one must not blindly accept all the utterances of the Fathers: "Eorum duntaxat Patrum sententiae conferendae sunt, qui in fide et communione catholica sancte, sapienter, constanter viventes, docentes et permanentes, vel mori in Christo fideliter, vel occidi pro Christo feliciter meruerunt." [55] He goes even farther and declares that, in the teaching of the Fathers, we must accept as certain only "quidquid vel omnes, vel plures uno eodemque sensu, manifeste, frequenter, perseveranter, velut quodam consentiente sibi magistrorum concilio, accipiendo, tenendo, tradendo firmaverint; quidquid vero, quamvis ille sanctus et doctus, quamvis episcopus, quamvis confessor et martyr, praeter omnes, aut etiam contra omnes senserit, id inter proprias et occultas et privatas

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 301.

[52] Mansi, X, 1071 and foll.

[53] As has been said already, the first two parts of this decree go back to the council of Rome in the year 382; the others are of a later period and probably received a few additions after the time of Pope Gelasius (492–496).

[54] We may recall here the answer of Hormisdas to Possessor, in connection with the books of Faustus, bishop of Riez: "Neque illum (Fauste) recipi, neque quemquam, quos in auctoritate Patrum non recipit examen, catholicae fidei aut ecclesiasticae disciplinae ambiguitatem posse gignere aut religiosis praeiudicium posse comparare" (*Epist.* LXX, August 13, 520, *P. L.*, LXIII, 490).

[55] *Commonitor.*, 28, 29, 3.

opiniunculas a communis et publicae ac generalis sententiae auctoritate secretum sit." [56]

Hence, above the authority of the Fathers, taken individually, there is another,— that of the Church which approves their works; that of the faith and general teaching of the Church, with which theirs must agree; the authority of all the Fathers conjointly prevails over the authority of each individual. "Praeiudicium secum damnationis exhibuit," Cassian writes, "qui iudicium universitatis impugnat." [57] The faith of all the churches is the voice of God.[58] We are thus brought back to the idea of an infallible teaching, of which the teaching of each Father, considered individually, is but the fallible organ, and which possesses the privilege of inerrancy only when the whole Church speaks.[59]

This condition is fulfilled when the pastors scattered all over the world together agree on a given doctrinal point; it is fulfilled also in general councils. That a council be truly ecumenical, St. Leo demands that the bishops be called thereto "de cunctis provinciis"; [60] but he does not demand that all, or even the majority, be actually present, since he gives the title of *general* council to the Council of Chalcedon, where the majority was certainly not present.[61] St. Vincent of Lerins does not hesitate to ascribe indisputable au-

[56] *Commonitor.*, 28.
[57] *De incarn.*, I, 6.
[58] *Ibid.*, v, 5.
[59] Like Tertullian and St. Irenæus, St. Fulgentius finds the guarantee of the integrity of the Church's belief in the economy of the episcopal succession in the Apostolic sees: "Quae fides usque nunc per successionum seriem in cathedra Petri apostoli Romae vel Antiochiae, in cathedra Marci evangelistae in Alexandria, in cathedra Ioannis evangelistae Ephesi, in cathedra Iacobi Hierosolymae, ab episcopis ipsarum urbium praedicatur" (*De Trinit.*, I).
[60] *Epist.* LXXXIX.
[61] *Epist.* CXIV.

thority to these solemn gatherings of the universal Church,[62] and St. Gregory, in a classical text, demands that the same reverence be paid to them as to the Gospels: "Sic quatuor synodos sanctae universalis Ecclesiae sicut quatuor libros sancti Evangelii recipimus."[63]

The belief of the universal Church is, then, a perfectly trustworthy rule of faith. Yet, as is well known, St. Vincent of Lerins seemingly does not deem it sufficient, since he demands, in order that a doctrine be accepted by the faithful, that it should have been held everywhere, always, and by all: "quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est. Hoc est etenim vere proprieque catholicum"; and he insists that the faithful should follow universality, antiquity, and the general consent: "Hoc ita demum fiet si sequamur universitatem, antiquitatem, consensionem."[64] He supposes that the first condition may be momentarily lacking, but not the last two.[65] There has been a great deal of discussion concerning the theological value of this canon, and the question has been raised whether it was not a weapon forged for the occasion and aimed at St. Augustine's teaching.[66] We will simply observe that, precisely because of his assertion of the unchangeableness of dogma and the inerrancy of the Church, Vincent must of necessity admit that the actual faith of the greater part of the Church represents the ancient belief, and that, in its own time, that belief was accepted by the greater part of the

[62] *Commonit.*, 28, 29.

[63] *Epist.* III, 10; cf. IV, 38; IX, 106, col. 1032. St. Gregory does not speak of the 5th general Council, either because he wished to preserve the comparison with the four Gospels, or rather because that Council had not given any directions in matters of faith.

[64] *Commonit.*, 2, 27.

[65] *Ibid.*, 3.

[66] Cf. a summary of the various opinions in P. DE LABRIOLLE, *Saint Vincent de Lérins*, Introduct., IX–XI.

teachers and the faithful. *Universitas* implies *antiquitas* and *consensio,* just as *consensio* in *antiquitas* implies *universitas.* St. Leo fully agrees with him in marking out antiquity, *vetustas,* as the sign by which truth is recognized: "Per omnia igitur, et in fidei regula et in observantia disciplinae vetustatis norma servetur."[67] Concerning the Scriptures, we cannot think or teach anything but what the Apostles and the ancients have thought and taught: "Cum ab evangelica apostolicaque doctrina ne uno quidem verbo liceat dissidere, aut aliter de Scripturis divinis sapere quam beati apostoli et patres nostri didicerunt atque docuerunt."[68] This is what theologians had always held, ever since St. Paul's *"Depositum custodi."*

As has been remarked, this concept is closely bound up with another, namely, that the doctrine preached by the Apostles must remain unchangeable in its substance. St. Leo and St. Vincent of Lerins repeat this truth over and over.[69] However, as the latter observes, substantial unchangeableness does not exclude a certain progress and development. All know the immortal passage in which the monk of Lerins defines in what that growth consists.[70] It must be a development, not a change (*ita tamen ut vere profectus sit ille fidei, non permutatio*), the progress of all and each in the understanding, science, and knowledge of the revealed doctrine, but without alteration of the previous belief (*in suo duntaxat genere, in eodem scilicet dog-*

[67] *Epist.* CXXIX, 2.

[68] *Epist.* LXXXII, 1.

[69] St. Leo: "Una est, vera, singularis catholica fides cui nihil addi nec minui potest" (*Epist.* CXXIV, 1). St. Vincent: "Annuntiare ergo aliquid christianis catholicis praeter id quod acceperunt nunquam licuit, nusquam licet, nunquam licebit; et anathematizare eos qui annuntiant aliquid praeterquam quod semel acceptum est nunquam non oportuit, nusquam non oportet, nunquam non oportebit" (*Commonit.,* 9, 24).

[70] *Commonit.,* 23.

mate, eodem sensu, eademque sententia) ; the ancient dogmas may be finished off and polished, but they must not be changed, diminished, or disfigured. They are susceptible of more evidence, light, and precision, but they must retain their fulness, integrity, and specific meaning.[71] This, Vincent goes on to say, is development of dogma as understood by the Church. She has made no change in the dogmas which she has received as a deposit. She has neither added to them nor taken from them. She has merely perfected and polished what was briefly outlined at the beginning. She has confirmed and fully illustrated what the past had formulated. She has kept what had been already defined. Councils made it their business simply " to provide that what was before believed in simplicity, should in the future be believed intelligently, that what was before preached coldly, should in the future be preached earnestly, that what was before practised negligently, should thenceforward be practised with double solicitude."

It is rather strange that St. Vincent ascribes no share to philosophy in this process of dogmatic development. Philosophy took a prominent part in religious thought in the following centuries; but during the period with which we are now concerned, it is scarcely noticeable. No doubt, it engrossed Boethius' mind almost entirely during his moments of leisure; but Boethius was not a churchman, and can be called a theologian only in an amateurish sense. Claudian Mamertus, too, holds philosophy in high esteem, even though he judges severely the pagans who have cultivated it.[72] These latter are also handled roughly by St. Prosper.

[71] " Fas est etenim ut prisca illa caelestis philosophiae dogmata processu temporis excurentur, limentur, poliantur: sed nefas est ut commutentur, nefas ut detruncentur, ut mutilentur. Accipiant licet evidentiam, lucem, distinctionem; sed retineant necesse est plenitudinem, integritatem, proprietatem."

[72] *De statu animae*, II, 2.

The attitude of St. Peter Chrysologus is still more radical. He denounces philosophy as a diabolical invention and calls the pagan philosophers "a choir of pestilence," because they have not been able to find and preach the true God.[73] St. Bede says that there is no school of philosophy that has not been charged with deceit by other philosophical schools which were just as foolish.[74] These declarations need not cause us surprise. At that period of political subversion, when all calculations and hopes seemed to be frustrated, it was but natural that reason should be little depended on to illustrate and confirm the truths of faith. Moreover, St. Gregory remarks that the divine action is incompatible, to some extent, with comprehension on the part of human reason, and that a faith of which the object could be verified by human understanding would not be meritorious.[75] Some excellent thoughts on the relation of reason to faith are found in the *Instituta regularia divinae legis* of Junilius (about 551);[76] but this work, though written in Latin by a native of Africa, was composed at Constantinople and, in its teachings and general trend of thought, is entirely dependent on the school of Theodore of Mopsuestia.

[73] *Sermo* XVI, col. 240; XLIV, col. 325.

[74] *Hexaëmeron,* III, col. 130.

[75] "Sciendum nobis est quod divina operatio, si ratione comprehenditur, non est admirabilis, nec fides habet meritum cui humana ratio praebet experimentum" (*Homil. in evang.,* XXVI, 1).

[76] "Fides nostra super ratione quidem est; non tamen temerarie et irrationabiliter assumitur: ea enim quae ratio edocet fides intellegit, et ubi ratio defecerit fides praecurrit. Non enim utcunque audita credimus, sed ea quae ratio non improbat. Verum quod consequi ad plenum non potest fideli prudentia confitemur" (*Instituta,* XXX, *P. L.,* LXVIII). Concerning Junilius, cf. the study of H. Kihn, *Theodor von Mopsuestia und Junilius Africanus als Exegeten,* Freiburg i. B., 1880.

§ 3. God and the Trinity.

That God can be known through His creatures is a commonplace topic among the writers whom we are now studying.[77] On the other hand, they also repeat over and over again that He infinitely surpasses man's intelligence and that we cannot understand His nature.[78] God is *principaliter;* He alone in truth *is;* He is above all forms and categories; as there is no genus superior to Him, and He is infinitely simple, He cannot be defined by genus and specific difference; we can say of Him what He is not; we cannot say of Him what He is.[79]

Whilst St. Gregory delights in praising the mercy of this transcendent God, Salvian dwells particularly on His justice. In the bitter apostrophies which he hurled at his contemporaries, this priest from Marseilles lays it down as a principle that there is no reason why we should ask ourselves whether the results of the divine action and providence in this world are just or unjust. By the very fact that they come from God, they are more than just.[80]

We have already referred to the numerous writings on the Trinity that were composed in defence of the Catholic faith against the Arian invaders, especially in Africa. But, on the whole, one searches that copious literature in vain for new principles or viewpoints that would mark a real progress over and beyond the teaching of St. Augustine. We find mainly accumulations of texts, as in the *Contra Maximinum* of

[77] St. Prosper, *In psalm.* CXLIV, verse 4; St. Gregory, *Moral.,* V, 52; XXVI, 17, 18; St. Isidore, *Sentent.,* I, 4.

[78] St. Gregory, *Moral.,* X, 13–15.

[79] St. Gregory, *Moral.,* XVI, 45; XVIII, 82; Cassiodorus, *In psalm.* II, verse 7; CXLI, conclusio.

[80] "Nec licet ut de his quae divino aguntur arbitrio, aliud dicas iustum, aliud iniustum: quia quidquid a Deo agi vides atque convinceris, necesse est plus quam iustum esse fatearis" (*De gubern. Dei,* III, 1).

Bishop Cerealis (ab. 484), or refutations of difficulties, as in the treatise ascribed to Vigilius of Tapsus. At all events, the Augustinian solution concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost is held as authoritative, and, all through the Latin Church, the teaching that the Holy Spirit proceeds *a Patre et Filio* is now received.[81] This is clearly evident from the writings of St. Fulgentius,[82] the *Contra Varimadum,*[83] and the works of Ferrandus,[84] who wrote the VIIIth book of the *De trinitate.*[85] At Rome there is the author of the *Arnobii catholici et Serapionis conflictus,*[86] then Boethius,[87] Popes St. Hormisdas[88] and St. Gregory the Great,[89] to mention only these; in Gaul, St. Prosper,[90] St. Eucherius,[91] Faustus of Riez,[92] Gennadius,[93] Julian Pome-

[81] However, we may notice the rather guarded expressions of the deacon Rusticus — Pope Vigilius' nephew — in his work *Contra acephalos,* which dates from about the year 550–555. He observes that some ancients (*quidam antiquorum*) have thought that the Holy Ghost does not proceed from the Son as He does from the Father (*non procedit Spiritus a Filio sicut a Patre*). Personally, he has not made up his mind regarding the fact or mode of that procession: "Utrum vero a Filio eodem modo quo a Patre procedat [Spiritus] nondum perfecte habeo satisfactum" (*P. L.,* LXVII, 1237). Rusticus lived for a while at Constantinople.

[82] *De fide,* 52; *De trinitate,* II; *Contra Fabianum,* fragm. XVIII, col. 774; XXXVI, col. 826; etc.

[83] II, 12.

[84] *Epist. IV,* ad Eugyppium, 1; V, ad Severum, 2 (*P. L.,* LXVII, 909, 911).

[85] *P. L.,* LXII, 287.

[86] II, 26.

[87] *Quomodo Trinitas unus Deus,* V (col. 1254).

[88] *Epist.* LXXIX, *P. L.,* LXIII, 514.

[89] *In evangel. homil.* XXVI, 2 (col. 1198); *Dialog.,* II, 38 (col. 204). The reader will notice that, in this last passage, the Greek translation has somewhat modified the original.

[90] *Liber sententiarum,* CCCLXXI (col. 489).

[91] *Instruct. ad Salonium,* I, 1 (*P. L.,* L, 774).

[92] *De Spiritu Sancto* I, 9. (This treatise is printed under the name of Paschasius, in *P. L.,* LXII, 17.)

[93] *De ecclesiast. dogm.,* I (col. 979–981; cf. Œhler, *Corpus haeresiol.,* I, p. 335, note).

rius,[94] St. Cæsarius,[95] Avitus of Vienne;[96] in Spain, Pastor of Galicia,[97] St. Isidore [98] and St. Ildefonsus [99] plainly assert it. Not only individual writers profess this teaching; it is embodied by Spanish councils in their professions of faith [100] and contained in the symbol *Quicunque vult,* of which we shall speak later.

When explaining the divine missions, St. Fulgentius and St. Gregory the Great also follow in the wake of St. Augustine. These missions have the processions for their principle and, as it were, merely prolong them *ad extra.* By the mere fact that the Son is begotten by the Father, and the Holy Ghost proceeds from both, the Son and the Holy Ghost are *sent,* as it were. That mission is complete when the Son becomes incarnate and the Holy Ghost is imparted to our souls through grace.[101]

[94] *De vita contemplativa,* I, 18 (*P. L.,* LIX, 432, 433).

[95] Engelbrecht, *Fausti reiensis opera,* p. 345. The sermon is really the work of St. Cæsarius.

[96] *Libri contra arrianos,* IX, X (p. 278).

[97] *Libellus in modum symboli* (middle of the 5th century), wrongly attributed to the 1st or 2d Council of Toledo, Hahn, *Biblioth.,* § 168; Kuenstle, *Antipriscilliana,* p. 43.

[98] *Etymol.,* VII, 4.

[99] *De cognit. baptismi,* III, col. 113.

[100] Cf. those of Reccared and the Gothic bishops in the 3d Council of Toledo (589), and of the 4th, 6th and 11th Councils of Toledo in the years 633, 638 and 675 (Hahn, § 177–180, 182). It is in the Council of the year 589, that we hear for the first time the Creed of Constantinople recited by Reccared himself with the addition "ex Patre et Filio procedentem" (Mansi, IX, 981; cf. Hefele, *Hist. of the Councils,* vol. IV, p. 416).

[101] St. Fulgentius: "Filius est igitur a Patre missus, non Pater a Filio, quia Filius est a Patre natus, non Pater a Filio. Similiter etiam Spiritus sanctus a Patre et Filio legitur missus quia a Patre Filioque procedit" (*Contra Fabian., fragm.* XXIX, col. 797). "Missio ergo Spiritus sancti collatio est invisibilis muneris, non apparitio personalis" (*ibid.,* col. 794.)—St. Gregory: "Eo enim ipso a Patre Filius mitti dicitur quo a Patre generatur. . . . Eius missio [Spiritus sancti] ipsa processio est qua de Patre procedit et Filio. Sicut itaque Spiritus mitti

St. Fulgentius reproduces the philosophic view of the Bishop of Hippo that the memory, intelligence, and will in the human soul are an image of the divine Trinity.[102] Julian of Toledo likewise appeals to St. Augustine to prove the legitimacy of his Trinitarian formula: "Voluntas genuit voluntatem sicut et sapientia sapientiam."[103] These repetitions of his own former teaching are decidedly inferior in originality to the two small books in which Boethius attempts to clear up and justify, by means of philosophy, the obscurities of that sublime mystery. The *Quomodo Trinitas unus Deus ac non tres dii* declares that, since the relations are, as it were, something external to the substance, the substance, and consequently the divine unity, is not affected by the personal relations that make up the Trinity.[104] The brief essay on the question *Utrum Pater et Filius ac Spiritus sanctus de divinitate substantialiter praedicentur*[105] answers this question in the negative, because, inasmuch as the divine substance is absolute and unique, whatever is affirmed of God *substantialiter,* is affirmed absolutely and identically of all three persons. Now, the three divine persons cannot be predicated one of the other, and are essentially relative. "Quo fit," Boethius concludes, "ut neque Pater, neque

dicitur quia procedit, ita et Filius non incongrue mitti dicitur quia generatur" (*In evang. homil.* XXVI, 2). Cf. Bede, *Homil.* II, 10, col. 182.

[102] *Contra Fabian., fragm.* XVIII, col. 771, 772.

[103] *De tribus capitulis liber apologeticus,* 3 (*P. L.,* XCVI). Julian explains (1) that, in that formula, the words *sapientia* and *voluntas* do not designate the divine persons, but the divine substance common to all. He asserts the orthodoxy of the following statement: "Filius igitur Dei de essentia Patris natus est, essentia de essentia, sicut natura de natura, et substantia de substantia; et tamen nec duae essentiae, nec duae naturae nec duae substantiae possunt dici, sed una essentia, natura atque substantia" (2).

[104] *P. L.,* LXIV, 1247–1256.

[105] *Ibid.,* 1299–1302.

Filius, neque Spiritus sanctus, nec Trinitas de Deo substantialiter praedicentur, sed, ut dictum est, ad aliquid." It is easy here to recognize the philosopher-theologian whose influence was so great during the Middle Ages, and also the fondness of incipient scholasticism for logic and accuracy of terms.

The Catholic belief in the Trinity received its definitive expression in the symbol *Quicunque,* which was universally adopted.[106] All scholars agree in asserting that the *Quicunque* is a document of exclusively Latin origin, in the composition of which St. Athanasius and the Greek Church had no share whatever. It is very probable that the document formed a whole from the beginning and was the work of one man. But critics are at a loss regarding its birthplace, date, and author. Treves, Southern Gaul, and especially Lerins, Rome, and Spain have been successively mentioned as the place of its origin. It has been ascribed to the 4th, 5th, 6th, and even 8th century, and looked upon as the work of Anastasius II (496–498), Venantius Fortunatus, Cæsarius of Arles, St. Vincent of Lerins, Honoratus or Hilary of Arles, St. Ambrose, and even St. Hilary of Poitiers. None of these theories can claim certainty.[107]

[106] Text in HAHN, § 150, or better in BURN, *op. inf. cit.,* p. 4–6, and the *Diction. de théologie catholique, sub vocabulo* ATHANASE (*Symbole de saint*).— More recent studies: OMMANEY, *The Early History of the Athanasian Creed,* London, 1880. D. G. MORIN, *Les origines du symbole Quicumque,* in the *Science catholique,* V, 1891; diverse articles in the *Revue bénédictine,* 1895, 1897, 1901; *L'origine du symbole d'Athanase* in the *Journal of Theological Studies,* XII (1911), p. 161–100, 337–361. E. BURN, *The Athanasian Creed and its Early Commentaries,* Cambridge, 1896. K. KUENSTLE, *Antipriscilliana,* IX, Freiburg i. B., 1905. H. BREWER, *Das sogenannte athanasianische Glaubensbekenntnis, ein Werk des heiligen Ambrosius,* Paderborn, 1909. Cf. also the article in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* referred to above.

[107] According to the most common view, the *Quicunque* was composed

What is beyond dispute is the authority possessed by that symbol in the Latin churches ever since the 7th century, and which caused it to be received into the liturgy during the 9th. Because of the clearness and force with which it expresses several dogmatic truths, this work of an unknown theologian has been rightly compared to the solemn definitions of councils. The Latin Church has adopted it as an authentic expression of the faith and an accurate summary of the teachings of her bishops and doctors on the subject of the Trinity and the Incarnation.

§ 4. The Angels.

Aside from the probation of the angels and the fall of a number of them, and the beneficent functions of the good angels and the malignity of demons, the Latin theologians of the 4th century, including St. Augustine, had left Christian angelology in a state of uncertainty and confusion. When were the angels created? What is their nature? Is there an order, a hierarchy among them, and what is its character? All these problems had not yet received a satisfactory answer. The theologians of subsequent centuries strove to clear up some of them; but in order to do this, they simply transplanted the speculations of the Pseudo-Areopagite to the West.

The time when the angels were created continued to be an object of dispute. St. Gregory merely says that they were created before man;[108] Gennadius, that they were created

between the years 430 and 540, and originated in that part of Southern Gaul which centers around Arles. Its formulas are quite similar to those of St. Augustine and the scholars of Lerins. However, Dom Morin, in his last articles in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, mentioned above, assigns its composition to the latter half of the 6th century and Spain as the probable country of its origin.

[108] *Moral.*, XXXII, 47.

immediately after heaven and earth.[109] Cassian regards them as anterior to the visible world;[110] and this is also the sentiment of Bede, who simply adopts St. Augustine's view that the angels are designated by the word *caelum* in the first verse of Genesis,[111] and that they received their existence first, before all other creatures.

What is their nature? Are they pure spirits or composed of spirit and body? St. Augustine thought it more probable that they had bodies. Cassian calls them spirits, but believes that they have bodies that are more subtle than ours.[112] This is also the view of Faustus,[113] Claudian Mamertus,[114] and Gennadius.[115] St. Fulgentius observes that " magni et docti viri " ascribe to the good angels a body of fire, and to the devils a body of air.[116] However, from St. Gregory onward, the contrary opinion gained ground, although it did not obtain universal acceptance. St. Gregory was acquainted with the works of the Pseudo-Areopagite. Whilst he did not reject absolutely the ancient opinions,[117] he openly declared in favor of the view that

[109] *De ecclesiast. dogm.*, 10. According to St. Isidore, their creation is recorded by the words *Fiat lux* (*Sentent.*, I, 10, 3).

[110] *Collat.* VIII, 7.

[111] *Hexaëmeron*, I, col. 14.

[112] It is worth while quoting his text, which shows that the words *body* and *spirit* had not then the strict meaning they have now: " Licet enim pronuntiamus nonnullas esse spiritales naturas, ut sunt angeli, archangeli, caeteraeque virtutes, ipsa quoque anima nostra, vel certe aer iste subtilis, tamen incorporeae nullatenus aestimandae sunt. Habent enim secundum se corpus quo subsistunt, licet multo tenuius quam nos. . . . Quibus manifeste colligitur nihil esse incorporeum nisi solum Deum " (*Coll.* VII, 13).

[113] *Epist.* III, p. 178 and foll. (col. 843).

[114] *De statu animae*, I, 13, 14; III, 6, 7.

[115] *De eccl. dogm.*, 12.

[116] *De trinit.*, IX.

[117] For instance, he remarks that, compared to our bodies, the angels are spirits, but compared to God, they are bodies. Like us, they are

the angels are purely spiritual beings who not only have no bodies, but in whom there is absolutely no composition of body and spirit.[118] At the same time, a bishop of Carthage, Licinianus (about 600), vigorously defended the same thesis against Faustus.[119] St. Gregory's authority led St. Isidore to accept it;[120] and thus the doctrine of the immateriality of the angels grew until it won universal assent.

Again, before St. Gregory, we find no definite teaching concerning the angelic orders and hierarchies. Cassian asks himself the reason for the names "angels," "archangels," "dominations" and "principalities," and explains the last two by the power which the angels exercise over nations, or the good angels over the bad.[121] St. Prosper observes that the word *angelus* (sent) does not designate the nature, but an accidental function of the angels: "Spiritus enim naturae nomen est, angelus actionis."[122] St. Gregory first introduces into Latin theology the teaching of Pseudo-Dionysius concerning the angelic orders. There are nine orders, and, beginning with the lowest, they are as follows: "angeli, archangeli, virtutes, potestates, principatus, dominationes, throni, cherubim atque seraphim."[123] The Pope explains the prerogatives and functions signified by these appellations, and observes that the heavenly spirits are not all

"circumscripti loco," but their knowledge infinitely surpasses ours (*Moral.*, II, 3; cf. *In evangel. homil.*, X, 1).

[118] *Moral.*, II, 8; IV, 8; *Dialog.*, IV, 29.

[119] *Epist. II ad Epiphanium* (*P. L.*, LXXII, 691 and foll.).

[120] *Etymol.*, VII, 5, 2; *Sentent.*, I, 10, 1, 19; *Different.*, II, 41. However, he seems to ascribe bodies to demons, at least for the present: "corpore aerei" (*Differ.*, II, 42).

[121] *Collat.* VIII, 14, 15.

[122] *In psalm.* CIII, verse 4.

[123] *In evangel. homil.* XXXIV, 7. In the *Moralia*, XXXII, 48, a somewhat different order is given: "angeli, archangeli, throni, dominationes, virtutes, principatus, potestates, cherubim et seraphim."

equal in dignity, since some send, and others are sent.[124] His views were adopted by St. Isidore.[125]

Concerning the trial of the angels, the perseverance of the good angels and the rebellion and fall of the demons, the authors now before us merely repeat what had been said before them. It was through their coöperation with divine grace that the good angels remained faithful.[126] They were rewarded for their fidelity by being confirmed in grace.[127] On the contrary, the demons fell through pride, "ad seipsos, non ad Deum conversi."[128] Nay, Cassian asserts that Satan committed two faults, one of pride, when he revolted against God, the other of jealousy, when he tempted Eve.[129] Through the authority of St. Augustine the famous text *Genesis* VI, 2, is no longer interpreted of intercourse between angels and women.[130]

The good angels not only contemplate God, who fills them with bliss; they also watch over the spiritual republic, the Church, over nations and individuals. Every nation and every individual has a guardian angel.[131] On the other hand all of us also have demons who follow our steps.[132] The demons throng our atmosphere, the air is infested with them; they wage war among themselves; but their chief war-

[124] *In evangel. homil.* XXXIV, 9, 10, 13.
[125] *Etymol.*, VII, 5; *Sentent.*, I, 10, 14, 15.
[126] Cassian, *Collat.* VI, 46.
[127] St. Gregory, *Moral.*, XXVII, 65; XXXII, 48.
[128] St. Fulgent., *De trinit.*, VIII; St. Gregory, *Moral.*, XXVIII, 11; St. Isidore, *Sentent.*, I., 10, 7, 8; St. Cæsar., *Sermo* CCXCVI (*P. L.*, XXXIX).
[129] *Collat.* VIII, 10. St. Peter Chrysologus also regards jealousy (*invidia*) as the cause of the angels' damnation (*Sermo* IV, col. 194).
[130] Cassian, *Collat.* VIII, 21. Concerning the demons, cf. Cassian's two conferences, the 7th and the 8th, which treat especially of them.
[131] Cassian, *Coll.* VIII, 17; St. Gregory, *Moral.* IV, 55; St. Isid., *Sentent.*, I, 10, 20, 21.
[132] Cassian, *Coll.* VIII, 17.

fare is against men, to whom they appear in various shapes, whom they attack and persecute materially, and whose souls they do their best to ruin;[133] however, they can do no hurt without God's permission.[134]

§ 5. Man. Grace. Merit.

St. Augustine left the problem of the origin of the human soul unsolved. The same uncertainty prevails among those later authors who depend upon him. Whilst the Semi-Pelagians and such independent writers as Cassian,[135] Gennadius,[136] and Cassiodorus,[137] teach that souls are created by God, St. Fulgentius,[138] St. Gregory,[139] St. Isidore[140] and St. Ildefonsus[141] persist in declaring that their origin is uncertain.

However, the origin of the soul was not the question that most violently agitated the 5th century. Faustus started a vehement controversy by asserting in his 3d and 5th letters[142] that the soul is corporeal, because it is localized *quantitative*. This idea, which was shared by Gennadius,[143]

[133] Cassian, *Coll.* VII, 32; VIII, 12, 13; St. Fulgentius, *De remiss. peccat.*, I, 6; St. Gregory, *Moral.*, II, 74.

[134] St. Prosper, *In psalm.* CIII, verses 20, 21; 25, 26; St. Gregory, *Moral.*, II, 16.

[135] *Coll.* VIII, 25.

[136] *De eccl. dogm.*, 14, 18. Gennadius observes that man has but one soul (*ibid.*, 15, 19, 20).

[137] *De anima*, II, VII.

[138] *De verit. praedestin.*, III, 28–32.

[139] *Epist.* IX, 52, col. 989, 990.

[140] *De eccles. officiis*, II, 24, 3. Even when he defines the soul, St. Isidore makes mention of the uncertainty of its origin: "Anima est substantia incorporea, intellectualis, rationalis, invisibilis, atque mobilis et immortalis, habens ignotam originem" (*Different.*, II, 92).

[141] *De cognit. baptismi*, XCVI.

[142] P. 174 and foll.; 188 and foll.

[143] *De eccles. dogm.*, 12. He also gives as a reason that the soul is "localiter circumscripta."

was refuted by Claudian Mamertus in his three books *De statu animae*[144] and by Licinianus of Carthage,[145] and was generally condemned by all other writers of that period,—Fulgentius,[146] Cassiodorus,[147] St. Gregory,[148] and St. Isidore.[149] The last-mentioned author says that "male . . . a quibusdam creditur animam hominis esse corpoream."[150] The invisibility and immortality of the soul, which follow naturally from its spirituality, are also accepted. However, regarding the former of these attributes, St. Gregory observes that at times God has miraculously rendered the souls of the departed visible, and he relates several instances.[151]

In the preceding chapter we have reviewed the controversies to which St. Augustine's teaching on grace gave rise, particularly in Gaul, and how they were settled by the second Council of Orange (529). The decisions of this Council were generally accepted. Like the Fathers of Orange, Cassiodorus,[152] St. Gregory,[153] and St. Isidore[154] teach that prevenient grace is necessary even for the beginning of faith; but they proclaim the free coöperation of the human will as indispensable: "Si superna gratia," writes St. Gregory, "nocentem non praevenit, nunquam profecto inveniet quem

[144] Cf. I, 8, 9, etc.

[145] *Epist.* II ad Epiphanium (*P. L.*, LXXII, 691 and foll.).

[146] *De veritate praedest.*, III, 32, 33.

[147] *De anima*, II. Cassiodorus defines the soul thus: "Anima hominis . . . est a Deo creata, spiritalis, propriaque substantia, sui corporis vivificatrix, rationabilis quidem et immortalis, sed in bonum malumque convertibilis" (*ibid.*).

[148] *Moral.*, V, 62. However, he observes that, although spiritual, the soul is affected by its union with the body.

[149] *Different.*, II, 92.

[150] *Sentent.*, I, 12, 2.

[151] *Dialog.*, IV, 5, 7 and foll.

[152] *In psalm.* X, vers. 9; XIII, vers. 2; L, vers. 6; LVIII, vers. 11; CVII, vers. 8.

[153] *Moral.*, XVI, 30; XVIII, 63; XXIV, 14; XXXIII, 38, 40.

[154] *Differ.*, II, 115 and foll.

remuneret innocentem. . . . Superna ergo pietas prius agit in nobis aliquid sine nobis, ut subsequente quoque nostro libero arbitrio, bonum quod iam appetimus agat nobiscum, quod tamen per impensam gratiam in extremo iudicio ita remunerat in nobis ac si solis processisset ex nobis." [155] Cassiodorus and St. Isidore seem also to have adopted the sentiments of the Council regarding the absolute inability of fallen man to do even moral good.[156]

In regard to the problems that had not received their solution at Orange, the teaching that continues to prevail during the 6th and 7th centuries is that of St. Augustine, though slightly tempered, at least in expression. The call of all men to the faith is gratuitous.[157] Likewise predestination is absolute for all, whether children or adults, and independently of their merits or faults. It is perfectly useless to ask ourselves why one is chosen and the other rejected: God's judgments in this matter are beyond our grasp; all that we know is that He is just and merciful.[158] The number of the elect is predetermined.[158a] According to St. Leo,[159] that number is small; according to St. Gregory,[160] it equals the number of the faithful angels; according to St. Isidore,[161] it equals the number of the fallen angels, which is

[155] *Moral.*, XVI, 30.

[156] Cassiodorus, *In psalm.* CVII, vers. 8; St. Isidore, *Different.*, II, 120.

[157] Cassiodorus, *In psalm.* V, vers. 15; XVII, 22.

[158] St. Gregory, *Moral.*, XXVII, 7; XXIX, 57, 77; XXXIII, 38; St. Isidore, *Different.*, II, 119, cf. 118; *Sentent.*, II, 6. St. Isidore follows St. Augustine altogether: "Unde consequens est nullis praevenientibus meritis conferri gratiam, sed sola voluntate divina. Nec quemquam salvari sive damnari, eligi vel reprobari nisi ex proposito praedestinantis Dei qui iustus est in reprobatis, misericors in electis" (*Differ.*, II, 119). As to St. Gregory, the question may be raised whether or not he admits reprobation *post praevisa merita*. Cf. *Moral.*, XXV, 32; XXXIII, 39.

[158a] St. Greg., *Moral.*, XXV, 21.

[159] *Sermo* XLIX, 2; cf. St. Gregory, *In evangel. homil.* XIX, 5.

[160] *In evangel. homil.* XXXIV, 11.

[161] *Sentent.*, I, 10, 13.

known to God alone. Regarding the lot of children who die unbaptized, our authors simply accept the view of St. Augustine, who consigns them to positive punishment in hell: "Perpetua quippe tormenta percipiunt," St. Gregory writes, "et qui nihil ex propria voluntate peccaverunt." [162] "Luunt in inferno poenas," says St. Isidore,[163] and St. Ildefonsus, almost literally reproducing St. Augustine: "Mitissima sane omnium poena erit eorum qui, praeter peccatum quod originale traxerunt, nullum insuper addiderunt." [164]

The barbarians who become neophytes and enter the Church, are reminded by moralists and preachers that faith without works is useless and dead: "Fides ergo nuda meritis inanis et vacua est." [165] But they add that, whereas works performed in the state of grievous sin are barren,[166] if done with God's grace they merit everlasting life and their merit is in proportion to the labor and effort expended: "Semen eorum," Cassiodorus declares, "significat opera fidelium, quae in hoc mundo seminantur, ut in illa aeternitate eorum laudabilis fructus appareat." [167]

§ 6. Christology and Soteriology.

In the 2d and following chapters of this book, we have dwelt at length on the Christological controversies that agitated the East from the 5th to the 7th century, and on the share that the West took therein, especially through the in-

[162] *Moral.*, IX, 32.

[163] *Sentent.*, I, 22, 2.

[164] *De cognit. baptismi*, LXXXIX. St. Avitus (*Poemata*, lib. VI, vers. 190 and foll.) mentions the fire: "Quae flammis tantum genuerunt membra parentes."

[165] Cassiodorus, *Epist.* IV, col. 845; Salvian., *De gubern. Dei*, IV, 1; St. Greg., *In evangel. homil.* XXVI, 9, 10.

[166] St. Caesarius, *Sermo* CCLXXVIII, 5 (*P. L.*, XXXIX).

[167] *In psalm.* CI, vers. 30; St. Greg., *In Ezechiel.*, I, homil. IX, 2; *Moral.*, VIII, 12; XXXIII, 40.

tervention of the popes. Regarding these questions and the formulas that resulted from the deliberations of the councils, the Latin Church had long come to a final decision and settled upon a definite terminology. No doubt, the teaching, which St. Leo proclaimed in his famous letter to Flavian, resembled the teaching of the school of Antioch more than that of St. Cyril; but as Latin theologians abstained from excessive speculation on this subject, they were able to avoid those extreme views which brought about the downfall of Nestorius and compromised Theodoret. On the whole they succeeded in keeping the golden mean between these extremes.

This moderate attitude is manifest at the very beginning of the dispute. We have, besides the letters of Pope Celestine against Nestorius, a treatise of Cassian, *De incarnatione Christi,* written at the request of the deacon Leo — later on Pope Leo I — in 430 or 431, at all events before the Council of Ephesus. Therein Cassian proclaims Mary θεοτόκος,[168] and proves that Jesus Christ is but one person, from the fact that Scripture ascribes to Him, as to one subject, what is of God and what is of man.[169] Whilst confessing that the Savior is consubstantial with the Father through His divinity, and with Mary through His humanity, he observes: "Non quod alter qui homoousios Patri, alter qui homoousios matri, sed quia idem Dominus Iesus Christus et homo natus et Deus utriusque in se parentis habuit proprietatem." [170]

This teaching of the duality of natures or of substances and the unity of person in Jesus Christ [171] can be found in

[168] II, 2, 4.
[169] V, 7, 8; VI, 22.
[170] VI, 13.
[171] Cf. for instance Vincent of Lerins, *Commonit.,* 13; St. Prosper, *In psalm.* CXLIV, vers. 1; *Arnobii catholici et Serapionis conflictus,*

all the authors here under review. With St. Leo it becomes the authoritative teaching of the Church. St. Fulgentius remarks, with his customary precision, that the union of the two natures in Christ took place at the time of the conception and that the humanity was conceived united to the Word; which explains both why Mary is the mother of God and why the two natures have never subsisted but in one person:

"Hanc ergo carnem tunc ex se natura virginis concipientis exhibuit, cum in eam Deus concipiendus advenit. Non est igitur aliquod intervallum temporis aestimandum inter conceptae carnis initium et concipiendae maiestatis adventum." [172] . . . "Ita Deum Verbum, secundum quod caro factum est virgo sancta concepit. . . . Neque enim sancta virgo Maria Deum sine carnis assumptione, aut carnem sine Dei unitione concepit, quia ille conceptus Virginis Deo fuit carnique communis." [173]

Moreover, at the very time when, in the East, Leontius of Byzantium was trying to analyze philosophically the notion of *person,* Boethius made the same attempt in Rome and upheld his conclusions against Nestorianism and Monophysitism. These researches are noted in the *Liber de persona et duabus naturis contra Eutychen et Nestorium,* addressed to John, a deacon of Rome. There Boethius gives

I, 18; Maximus of Turin, *Sermo* XLIII (col. 621); Gennadius, *De eccl. dogm.,* 2, 3; etc. Some speak of two natures; others prefer the word substance; for instance Vincent of Lerins and the author of the *Arnobii . . . conflictus* (I, 18). The view of Julian of Toledo, who affirmed the presence of three substances in Christ, by counting the body and the soul as two substances, was singular and he was called to account for it. Cf. his *De tribus capitulis liber apologeticus,* 4–17, 18.

[172] *Epist.* XVII, 7.

[173] *Ibid.,* 12.

the Latin equivalent of the Greek words *οὐσία, οὐσίωσις, ὑπόστασις, πρόσωπον* (III);[174] what he gives are mainly carefully worked-out definitions of nature and person. The first is as follows: *"Natura est unamquamque rem informans specifica differentia"* (I, col. 1342); the second is well known; *"Persona est naturae rationalis individua substantia"* (III, col. 1343).[175] It asserts that only individual and intelligent substances can be persons. No doubt, the introduction of "intelligence" and "liberty" into the concept of person marked a real progress; however, Boethius' definition did not sufficiently assert that, to be physically a person, an individual substance must form an independent and separate whole, and it is only by means of a rather broad interpretation of the word *individua*[176] that philosophers and theologians have succeeded in preserving its classical character.

By means of these notions, Boethius refutes (IV–VI) Nestorius and Eutyches, and explains (VII) how Jesus Christ is both *of* and *in* two natures (*Christum in utrisque et ex utrisque naturis consistere*), these two ways of speaking being equally accurate, if properly understood. The 8th and last chapter states that the Savior assumed something of each of the three states of Adam — before the Fall, after the Fall and in the state in which he would have been, had he not sinned; from the first, Jesus took the physical functions, such as drinking, eating, etc.; from the second, suffering and death; and from the third, confirmation in grace.

[174] This short essay is rather interesting; we notice particularly that Boethius translates *ὑπόστασις* not by *persona,* but by *substantia,* which is in fact its literal equivalent.

[175] With this definition compare that given by Cassiodorus: "Persona hominis est substantia rationalis, individua, suis proprietatibus a consubstantialibus caeteris segregata" (*In psalm.* VII, Divisio psalmi).

[176] *Individuum est quod est indivisum in se et divisum a quocumque alio.*

The duality of nature results in a duality of operation and will, as St. Leo had noted in his letter to Flavian (4). He returns to the subject in his LVIth sermon, n. 2: "Superiori igitur voluntati voluntas cessit inferior." Maximus of Turin also dwells on the same conclusion: "In uno eodemque Redemptore nostro disiuncta operatio divinitatis et humanitatis";[177] and we have seen with what perfect agreement the whole West, at Pope Agatho's request, asserted the same doctrine. In the letter written by this Pope to Constantine Pogonatus we find this doctrine stated with fullness and accuracy.[178]

As the problems raised by Nestorianism, Monophysitism, and Monothelitism brought on the intervention of the Latin Church in the East, so that Church had also to concern herself with certain secondary problems connected therewith.

Count Reginus asked St. Fulgentius what view he should take of the incorruptibility of Christ's body, concerning which the Alexandrian Monophysites were then disputing among themselves. St. Fulgentius answered[179] that there is a corruption of the soul and a corruption of the body, and that even in this latter we must distinguish between a corruption that produces sin and is accompanied by sin, and another that is a mere punishment of sin. Jesus Christ could not experience a corruption of the soul, nor concupiscence; but He *did* experience the needs and infirmities that are in us as a consequence of sin, such as hunger, thirst, and death; nay, His body would have been dissolved in the grave (*corruptio putredinis*), had it not been preserved from that fate by His speedy resurrection.[180] In the treatise

[177] *Sermo* CVII, col. 743.
[178] Cf. above, p. 175.
[179] *Epist.* XVIII.
[180] "Hoc autem non eiusdem carnis incorruptibilitas, sed resurrectionis celeritas fecit" (7); and further (9): "Impossibile ut corruptibilitas esse negetur ubi animalis corporis mortalitas invenitur."

which he sent to Thrasamond (III, 31), the Saint adds that this preservation was becoming to Christ's dignity. Moreover, these weaknesses and infirmities, as well as the motions of indifferent passions, were in Him both voluntary and natural, because He might have dispensed Himself from them: "veras quidem sed voluntarias habuit." [181]

After the error of the Aphthardocetæ, that of the Agnoetæ drew the attention of the Latin theologians. We have already mentioned St. Gregory's two letters to Eulogius of Alexandria, in which the Pontiff denies that Christ, as man, was subject to ignorance, and answers certain objections.[182] Before his time, however, the author of the treatise *De Trinitate,* which is ascribed to Vigilius of Tapsus, had apparently granted that Jesus Christ, as man, could be ignorant; [183] and, whilst teaching that the Savior's soul possessed a full knowledge of His divinity,[184] St. Fulgentius deemed the advance of the Christ-child in knowledge real.[185] But Cassiodorus,[186] following in the steps of St. Augustine, had already decided the question in connection with *Mark* XIII, 32, in the same sense as St. Gregory, and St. Gregory's authority carried the general assent of those writers who took their inspiration from him. This was the conclusion

[181] *Epist.* XVIII, 10; *Ad Trasimundum,* III, 25.

[182] These are letters X, 35 and 39. There is one objection which the Pope mentions, but which his infirmities prevent him from answering: "Ad haec vero mihi idem communis filius Anatolius diaconus respondit aliam quaestionem dicens: Quid, si obiiciatur mihi, quia sicut immortalis mori dignatus est ut nos liberaret a morte, et aeternus ante tempora fieri voluit temporalis, ita Dei sapientia ignorantiam nostram suscipere dignata est, ut nos ab ignorantia liberaret" (*Epist.* X, 39, col. 1098).

[183] *De trinit.,* XI, col. 306.

[184] *Epist.* XIV, 29, 30, 31; cf. 33.

[185] "Sapientia quoque novimus Christum secundum animam profecisse" (*Ad Trasimund.,* III, 18; I, 8).

[186] *In psalm.* IX, vers. 40.

adopted by St. Isidore of Seville and St. Julian of Toledo.[187] As to Bede, he taught not only that Jesus knew the day and hour of judgment, but also that the divine Child's progress in wisdom and grace was purely external, the Savior revealing little by little to the eyes of men the grace and wisdom of which He was full from the moment of His conception.[188]

Unlike the dogma of the Incarnation, that of the Redemption was never studied and treated for its own sake in ancient theology; hence we must not be surprised to find, in the authors whose doctrine we are reviewing, hardly more than a repetition of what had been said before.[189]

However, the physical or mystical theory — which sees in the fact of the Incarnation itself a principle of renewal for the human nature that is thus united to the divine nature — a theory scarcely noticed by other Latin theologians, is set forth by St. Leo, who is moved thereto partly by the deeper conception of human corruption gained from the Pelagian controversy, and partly by his own reflections on the mystery of the God-man. Satan in his wickedness destroyed God's primitive plan and spoiled His work; human nature, created sound and immortal, has become corrupt in body and soul through death and sin. It cannot heal itself: "Lethali vulnere tabefacta natura nullum remedium reperiret, quia conditionem suam suis viribus mutare non

[187] St. Isidore, *Sentent.*, I, 27, 1; St. Julian, *Prognostic.*, III, 1.

[188] *In Matth.*, cap. XXIV, col. 104; *Homil.* I, 12, col. 67: "Iuxta hominis quippe naturam proficiebat sapientia, non quidem ipse sapientior ex tempore existendo, qui a prima conceptionis hora spiritu sapientiae plenus permanebat, sed eamdem qua plenus erat sapientiam caeteris ex tempore paulatim demonstrando. . . . Iuxta hominis naturam proficiebat gratia, non ipse per accessum temporis accipiendo quod non habebat, sed pandendo donum gratiae quod habebat."

[189] Cf. J. Rivière, *Le dogme de la Rédemption*, chap. XVI, XVII (English translation).

posset." [190] Nor can this state be remedied by a cure applied from the outside, as it were, such as teaching and good example; [191] something more intimate is needed; the Word of God, Himself God, by uniting Himself to the human nature and taking it into Himself, must cure it from evil and renew it. Therefore the Incarnation is necessary, not absolutely, but on the supposition that the divine mercy is willing to raise us up again and save us: "Nisi Verbum Dei caro fieret et habitaret in nobis, nisi in communionem creaturae Creator ipse descenderet, et vetustatem humanam ad novum principium sua nativitate revocaret, regnaret mors ab Adam usque in finem, et super omnes homines condemnatio insolubilis permaneret." [192] Once He has thus become our head through the Incarnation, Jesus Christ, God and man, imparts to us who are His members the virtue that is in Him: "Nihil enim non ad nostram salutem aut egit aut pertulit (Christus), ut virtus quae inerat capiti inesset etiam et corpori." [193] This does not mean that St. Leo regards the Incarnation as alone sufficient to save us. On the contrary, he declares that "Christ's passion contains the mystery of our salvation," [194] and that Jesus Christ saves us only through His death; [195] besides, we shall see presently that he is acquainted with the realistic theory of the Redemption. It remains true, however, that alone or almost alone [196] among the Latin writers of the epoch we are now considering, St. Leo assigns to the mystical theory an important place in his teaching. Most of the authors of this

[190] *Sermo* XXIV, 2; cf. LVI, 1; LXXVII, 2.
[191] *Sermo* XXIII, 3.
[192] *Sermo* XXV, 5; LII, 1.
[193] *Sermo* LXVI, 4.
[194] *Sermo* LV, 1; cf. LVII, 1.
[195] *Sermo* LIX, 1; LXIII, 4.
[196] An echo of the same theory may be found in a letter of St. Paulinus of Nola, *Epist.* XII, 3, 6 (*P. L.*, LXI, 201, 203).

period espouse the realistic theory, which regards the Passion of our Lord as the real cause of our salvation. Independently of its objective truth, this theory was more accessible to the uncouth intelligences that had to be won over to the Gospel, and more capable of making a deep impression upon them. St. Gregory in particular set it forth fully and with much success; some details found in other writers are also worth noticing.

Most of the authors with whom we are concerned begin by affirming man's inability to extricate himself from the bonds of sin; in order to do this, they say, one must be innocent and free, whereas all men were and still are captives and sinners.[197] The merits of the saints were of no avail;[198] even the angelic nature would not have sufficed, for that nature is fallen.[199] What, then, was needed? God Himself must take our nature, our whole nature, and by raising it up, make it capable of wiping out the sins of the world: "Nullatenus namque humana natura ad auferendum peccatum mundi sufficiens atque idonea fieret, nisi in unionem Verbi Dei, non naturali confusione, sed solum personali unitate transiret."[200] Again: "Revera homo salvari non potuit, si vel susceptor hominis naturaliter verus Deus non fuit, vel in Dei veri susceptione aliquid hominis defuit."[201] The restoration of the human race could not take place, then, except through a Man-God. Was it sufficient for the Word to become incarnate? No, for although the Incarnation, according to a beautiful thought of St. Gregory,[202] is by itself a perpetual sacrifice, the expiation of sin demanded that he who came to annihilate it and

[197] Cassian, *De incarn.*, IV, 12; V, 15.
[198] St. Leo, *Sermo* LXIV, 2.
[199] St. Fulgentius, *Ad Trasimund.*, II, 2.
[200] St. Fulg., *Epist.* XVII, 9.
[201] St. Fulg., *Ad Trasimund.*, I, 7.
[202] *Moral.*, I, 32.

its consequences should be positively punished. Therefore "sicut propter redemptionem mundi illum [Christum] decuit nasci, ita et pati oportuit."[203] Thus, the Man-God suffered, because He was our representative and contained all of us, as it were, in Himself. He was in some way our representative by the fact of the Incarnation, since He thereby assumed our nature; but He did much more than that by voluntarily taking upon Himself the responsibility for our sins, and the punishment due to them. This is the idea of penal substitution; we find it everywhere: "Causam omnium suam fecit [Christus]," says Cassiodorus.[204] "Quoniam peccata non habuit [Christus] propria," St. Fulgentius writes, "portare dignatus est aliena";[205] and St. Gregory: "Poenam culpae nostrae [Christus] sine culpa suscepit."[206] This being the case, Jesus Christ is justly punished by the Father for our faults. He is delivered to Satan, *i.e.,* Pilate and the Jews,[207] as we ourselves ought to have been. Through His death, He who was innocent paid the debt that weighed upon us: "Eos ille a debitis suis eripuit qui pro nobis sine debito mortis mortem solvit. . . . Qui enim pro nobis mortem carnis indebitam reddidit nos a debita animae morte liberavit."[208] "Poenam peccati nostri suscepit, ut per indebitam poenam suam debitam aboleret culpam nostram."[209] His blood is the ransom and price of our freedom.[210] Henceforth the divine wrath is assuaged, and, whilst man

[203] St. Isid., *De fide cath. contra Iud.,* I, 5, 11.
[204] *In psalm.* XXI, vers. 28.
[205] *Ad Trasimund.,* III, 29; *De fide,* 12.
[206] *Moral.,* XIII, 35; III, 26–29; IV, 56; IX, 61. St. Isidore, *Sentent.,* I, 14, 12.
[207] St. Greg., *Moral.,* III, 26–29.
[208] St. Greg., *In evangel. homil.* XXXIX, 8; *Moral.,* XVII, 47.
[209] St. Isid., *Sentent.,* I, 14, 12.
[210] Bede, *Homil.,* II, 1, col. 138; cf. St. Leo, *Sermo* LXII, 3.

finds in Christ's example lessons of sanctity, God is obliged, as it were, to put a stop to the effects of His justice:

"Quia iustus in hominibus solus (Christus) apparuit, et tamen ad poenam culpae etiam sine culpa pervenit, et hominem arguit ne delinqueret, et Deo obstitit ne feriret. . . . Patiendo ergo utrumque arguit, qui et culpam hominis iustitiam aspirando corripuit, et iram iudicis moriendo temperavit. . . . et exemplo hominibus quae imitarentur praebuit, et Deo in se opera, quibus erga homines placaretur, ostendit." [211]

Cassiodorus observed that this appeasement of the divine wrath and God's merciful attitude towards us go back, to some extent, to the moment of the Incarnation, when the Father gave us Christ as priest and victim.[212] These words suggest another point of view from which Patristic writers consider the death of Jesus. That death is a sacrifice; [213] it is a necessary sacrifice, as St. Gregory observes, because the fault could not be wiped out except by a sacrifice, the victim of which was, not an irrational animal or a guilty man, but one spotless and holy; [214] the sacrifice of which Jesus Christ is both priest and victim.[215] He has offered His life as a sacrifice: "Fecit pro nobis sacrificium, corpus

[211] St. Greg., *Moral.*, IX, 61; cf. XXIV, 6. Cfr. this utterance of St. Leo: ". . . ut Pater propitiaretur, Filius propitiaret, Spiritus sanctus igniret" (*Sermo* LXXVII, 2).

[212] *In psalm.* LXIV, vers. 3.

[213] Cassian, *De coenob. instit.*, III, 3.

[214] *Moral.*, XVII, 46.

[215] "Per Aaron sacerdotem ille indicatur sacerdos qui veri pontificis sacramentum, non in alieni generis hostia, sed in oblatione corporis et sanguinis sui solus implevit: idem sacerdos, idem victima, propitiator et propitiatio, omniumque mysteriorum quibus nuntiabatur effector" (St. Prosper, *In psalm.* CXXXII, vers. 2; cf. St. Fulg., *Epist.* XIV, 37; *Ad Trasimund.*, III, 30; St. Leo, *Sermo* LXVIII, 3).

suum exhibuit pro peccatoribus victimam sine peccato."[216] He offered it freely, for He was not compelled to suffer.[217] Owing to His sacrifice, which was offered especially for our sins, we have been delivered from our faults, freed from death, and reconciled to God.[218] According to a famous phrase of St. Leo, cited by Cassiodorus, all men have been crucified, all have died, all have been buried and raised again in Christ.[219]

In the preceding exposition we have considered the death of Christ from the human point of view, as a remedy for the fall, and from God's point of view, as an expiation of sin demanded by His justice and a means of restoring man to His friendship. Satan also is concerned in this mystery. Man was his captive through sin, and Redemption snatches that captive away from him. Does this take place through force or through justice? Through justice. The reader may recall that, following in Origen's footsteps, St. Ambrose had represented the blood of Christ as a price paid to the devil for our redemption. Later that explanation was forgotten among the Latin theologians, who adopted the theory of the abuse of power, which had had St. Augustine's preference, and is expressed several times by St. Leo. God could have made use of His omnipotence to snatch us away from Satan; but He did not do so; He willed that everything should be done according to the demands of justice. "Magis uteretur iustitia rationis quam potestate virtutis";[220] moreover, it was fitting that mankind should free itself, as it were, by its own efforts, and that Satan

[216] St. Greg., *Moral.*, XVII, 46.

[217] St. Prosper, *In psalm.* CVIII, vers. 5; CIII, vers. 19; Cassiodorus, *In psalm.* LXXXVII, vers. 5.

[218] St. Leo, *Sermo* LIV, 3; St. Fulg., *Ad Trasimund.*, I, 15; Bede, *In I Ioann.*, IV, col. 108; *In Ioann.*, III, col. 671.

[219] St. Leo, *Epist.* CLXV, 5; Cassiodorus, *In psalm.* LIV, conclusio.

[220] *Sermo* LXIV, 2; XXII, 3; XXVIII, 3; LVI, 1.

should be conquered by that same nature over which he had triumphed: "ut nequitiae hostilis adversitas de eo quod vicerat vinceretur, et per ipsam naturam naturalis repararetur libertas per quam generalis fuerat illata captivitas."[221] Therefore the Divine Logos becomes incarnate; He assumes our infirmities and weaknesses, thereby deceiving the devil, who regards Jesus as an ordinary man, persecutes Him, and finally puts Him to death as though the Savior was his and deserved such a punishment. This is an abuse of power for which Satan deserves to be punished. Since he has unjustly struck one who was innocent, he shall lose his claims over those who are guilty, and sinners shall become free: "Per iniustitiam plus petendi, totius debiti summa vacuatur."[222] We find the same ideas, on the whole, in Fulgentius Ferrandus,[223] St. Cæsarius,[224] Cassiodorus,[225] St. Gregory[226] and St. Isidore.[227]

The poets breathed life into these dull and uninspiring theories, and described in picturesque terms the deception and defeat of the devil, who was misled by the human appearance of Jesus. The reader may recall St. Gregory of Nyssa's comparison of Satan to a greedy fish that falls upon the bait and is caught by the hook.[228] The writers we are now considering turn this simile to account and repeat it over and over.[229] Another comparison similar to this is

[221] *Sermo* LXIII, 1.
[222] *Sermo* XXII, 3, 4; LXI, 4; LXIV, 2; LXIX, 3, 4.
[223] *Epist.* III, 5.
[224] *Homilia* III *de paschate,* col. 1049.
[225] *In psalm.* LIV, conclusio.
[226] *Moral.,* XVII, 46, 47. It will be observed that in this passage St. Gregory calls Satan's power *almost just.* St. Isidore qualifies his statements in a similar way.
[227] *Sentent.,* I, 14, 12.
[228] Cf. *Hist. of Dogmas,* vol. II, p. 155.
[229] Fulg. Ferrand, *Epist.* III, 5; Cassiod., *In psalm.* LIV, conclusio; St. Greg., *Moral.,* XXXIII, 14, 17; *In evangel. homil.* XXV, 8; St. Isid., *Sentent.,* I, 14, 14.

that of the bird attracted by the wheat and caught in a net.[230] All such comparisons are meant to represent the victory of Christ over the arch-enemy of mankind.

§ 7. Ecclesiology.

Augustine's writings against the Donatists had clearly brought out the truth that the visible Church is a *corpus mixtum,* a field where the good wheat and the tares grow side by side. This doctrine was held in Africa by St. Fulgentius,[231] and at Rome by St. Gregory, who passes it on to St. Isidore of Seville.[232] In heaven, St. Gregory remarks, there are only the just; in hell, only the wicked; but here below the Church comprises both categories: "In hac ergo Ecclesia nec mali sine bonis, nec boni sine malis esse possunt." [233] Nevertheless the Church is the body of Jesus Christ, and, according to St. Prosper's expression, forms but one man with Him: "Caput et corpus, Christus et Ecclesia unus homo, unus est Christus." [234]

Thus, as Christ is the source of all truth and grace, so the Church is the sole depositary of religious truth, grace, and salvation. She has the mission to teach all men and to lead them on to heaven. This she does infallibly. She is the custodian and dispenser of the divine gifts that are the fruit of the Redemption and can be profitably received only through her hands. Listen to Cassiodorus' eloquent apostrophe: "O vere sancta, o immaculata, o perfecta mater Ecclesia quae, divina gratia largiente, sola vivificas, sola sanctificas. . . . cuius piae confessioni nihil addi, nihil minui potest. . . . sola inoffenso fidei cursu sine periculo

[230] St. Greg., *Moral.,* XXXIII, 31; St. Isid., *Sentent.,* I, 14, 13.
[231] *De remiss. peccat.,* I, 18; *De fide,* 84.
[232] *Sentent.* I, 16, 3.
[233] *In evang. homil.* XXXVIII, 7, 8.
[234] *In psalm.* CXXVII, vers. 4.

diluvii constanter enavigas, nec ullis erroribus acquiescis. . . . Nescis loqui nisi quod expedit credi." [235] Before him St. Fulgentius had said with more precision: "Extra Ecclesiam catholicam nullus accipit indulgentiam peccatorum. . . . Extra hanc Ecclesiam nec christianum nomen aliquem iuvat, nec baptismus salvat, nec mundum Deo sacrificium offertur, nec peccatorum remissio accipitur, nec aeternae vitae felicitas invenitur. Una est enim Christi Ecclesia, una columba, una dilecta, una sponsa." [236]

Hence, outside the Church neither are good works profitable, nor can martyrdom itself be crowned; [237] which means that outside the Church there is no salvation. St. Fulgentius reasserts this teaching in a classical passage: "Firmissime tene et nullatenus dubites quemlibet haereticum sive schismaticum in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti baptizatum, si Ecclesiae catholicae non fuerit aggregatus, quantascumque eleemosynas fecerit, etsi pro Christi nomine etiam sanguinem fuderit, nullatenus posse salvari." [238]

At the time of which we are treating, the Church in the West had begun to receive into her bosom the barbarian hordes which invaded the empire. Both from the parceling out of the territories that formerly belonged to the Romans and from the formation of new independent kingdoms, there resulted a pause in the movement of centralization which, especially for a century, tended to strengthen, from an ecclesiastical standpoint, the bonds that united the individual

[235] *In psalterium,* praefatio, XVII, col. 23.

[236] *De remiss. peccatorum,* I, 22. Cf. St. Prosper, *In psalm.* CXXXI, vers. 7; CXLVII, vers. 13.

[237] Cassiodor., *In psalm.* CXV, vers. 6; St. Greg., *Moral.,* XXV, 12, 13; St. Isid., *Sentent.,* I, 16, 12.

[238] *De fide,* 80; cf. 78–79; St. Greg., *Moral.,* XIV, 5; Bede, *Hexaemeron,* I, col. 85, 86. In the *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua,* which date from the 6th century, the candidate to the episcopacy is asked if he believes "si extra ecclesiam nullus salvetur" (*P. L.,* LVI, col. 880).

churches to that of Rome.[239] The opposition to the 5th general Council and the decisions of Vigilius, which during the 6th century swept entire provinces into schism, is a fact that must not be overlooked, when we ask ourselves what sort of an idea of the Roman primacy the refractory bishops had. However, on the whole, and aside from the mistaken views of certain individuals, the primacy was accepted as a matter of course throughout the West. It was clearly understood that in questions of dogma and general discipline the Pope's decisions were authoritative; that his decretals were law; that Rome was the center of unity and that the integrity of faith and Christian life could be preserved only in communion with the Apostolic See. Peter has been declared by Jesus to be the foundation and the leader of the universal Church, her infallible teacher and master, and Peter continues to live and speak through his successors.[240] These ideas and expressions are found in many a text of the authors now before us: for instance, in the works of St. Peter Chrysologus,[241] Maximus of Turin,[242] St. Fulgentius [243] and St. Bede.[244] They are eloquently developed by St. Leo and St. Gregory. We are all familiar with the noble periods in which the former unfolds the economy of the evangelization of the world and the government of the Church:

[239] On this point, cf. L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien*, p. 29 and foll. (English transl., p. 40 and foll.).

[240] Concerning the history of the word "papa," cf. P. De Labriolle, in the *Bulletin d'ancienne littérature et d'archéologie chrétiennes*, I (1911), p. 215 and foll. In the 6th century, the title *pope*, which until then had been applied indiscriminately to bishops, began to be reserved to the bishop of Rome. In the 7th century, this custom prevails in the West.

[241] *Epist. ad Eutychet.*, inter epist. S. Leonis, *Epist.* XXV, 2.

[242] *Sermo* XCIV, col. 722; *Homil.* LIV, col. 353.

[243] *Epist.* XVII, 21.

[244] *Homil.*, II, 16, col. 223.

" Divinae cultum religionis, quem in omnes gentes omnesque nationes Dei voluit gratia coruscare, ita Dominus noster Iesus Christus humani generis salvator instituit, ut veritas, quae antea legis et prophetarum praeconio continebatur per apostolicam tubam in salutem universitatis exiret. . . . Sed huius muneris sacramentum ita Dominus ad omnium apostolorum officium pertinere voluit, ut in beatissimo Petro omnium apostolorum summo principaliter collocarit; et ab ipso quasi quodam capite dona sua velit in corpus omne manare, ut exsortem se mysterii intellegeret esse divini qui ausus fuisset a Petri soliditate recedere. Hunc enim in consortium individuae unitatis assumptum, id quod ipse erat voluit nominari dicendo: *Tu es Petrus et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam* (*Matth.*, XVI, 18); ut aeterni templi aedificatio mirabili munere gratiae Dei, in Petri soliditate consisteret: hac Ecclesiam suam firmitate corroborans, ut illam nec humana temeritas posset appetere nec portae contra illam inferi praevalerent." [245]—" Manet ergo, dispositio veritatis, et beatus Petrus in accepta fortitudine petrae perseverans, suscepta Ecclesiae gubernacula non reliquit. Sic enim prae caeteris est ordinatus ut, dum petra dicitur, dum fundamentum pronuntiatur, dum regni caelorum ianitor constituitur, dum ligandorum solvendorumque arbiter, mansura etiam in caelis iudiciorum suorum definitione praeficitur, qualis ipsi cum Christo esset societas per ipsa appellationum eius mysteria nosceremus. Qui nunc plenius et potentius ea quae sibi commissa sunt peragit. . . . In universa namque Ecclesia *Tu es Christus Filius Dei vivi* quotidie Petrus dicit, et omnis lingua quae confitetur Dominum magisterio huius vocis imbuitur. . . . His itaque modis, dilectissimi, rationali obsequio celebratur hodierna festivitas, ut in persona humilitatis meae ille intellegatur, ille

[245] *Epist.* X, 1.

honoretur, in quo et omnium pastorum sollicitudo cum commendatarum sibi ovium custodia perseverat et cuius dignitas etiam in indigno haerede non deficit." [246]

St. Gregory's style is decidedly inferior to that of his great predecessor; but he too forcefully affirms that St. Peter "primus erat in apostolatus culmine"; that he is the prince of the Apostles, to whom "cura totius Ecclesiae et principatus committitur"; [247] that the bishop of Rome is the head of the faith (*caput fidei*); that his judgment in questions of faith is supreme; that the see of Rome "universali Ecclesiae iura sua transmittit"; that, like the other churches, that of Constantinople is subject to Rome; and that what is decided in synods does not bind except by consent and authority of the Apostolic See.[248] What is still more remarkable is that these two great popes succeeded in carrying these ideas, which existed long before them, into the daily lives of their contemporaries, as it were, and, through their solicitude for all the churches and their constant intervention in all parts of the world, made their ecumenical authority a reality that was felt everywhere.[249] Among their successors, Hormisdas,[250] Martin I, and

[246] *Sermo* III, 3, 4; V, 4. On the divine origin and right of the papal primacy, cf. the decree of Gelasius, II: "Romana ecclesia nullis synodicis constitutis caeteris ecclesiis praelata est, sed evangelica voce Domini et salvatoris nostri primatum obtinuit" (*Matth.* XVI, 18).

[247] *In Ezechiel*, II, homil. VI, 9; *In evang. homil.* XXIV, 4; *Epist.* V, 18, 20, col. 740, 746; VII, 40, 41.

[248] *Epist.* III, 57; V, 54; IX, 12, col. 957; IX, 68, col. 1005; XIII, 37.

[249] However, the readers may recall that St. Gregory refused the title of universal patriarch (*Epist.* V, 43, col. 771; VIII, 30, col. 933).

[250] The famous formula to which Hormisdas made the Greek bishops subscribe in 519, stresses two ideas: (1) the rule of faith is found in the teaching of the Fathers and more especially in that of the Apostolic See; (2) no one can be in communion with the Church unless he is in communion with the Apostolic See (*P. L.*, LXIII, col. 444, 445).

Agatho were equally emphatic in asserting their claims. The last mentioned Pope vigorously enforced his doctrinal decision in the affair of Monothelitism. None of these pontiffs ever thought that their teaching could be reconsidered or their orthodoxy challenged.

On the other hand, though the Church sets herself up as supreme in the spiritual domain, her relations with the State, which is supreme in the temporal order,[251] become more and more intimate. During the period which we are studying, the civil authorities, weakened in the territories still under Roman dominion, and inexperienced and uneducated in the new barbarian kingdoms, willingly lean on the moral prestige of the clergy and ask for the help of its learning. The Church, which was antagonized by many of the invaders as well as by the Empire, is forced to appeal now and then to the secular power to protect herself from attacks which her anathemas were not strong enough to ward off. Following in St. Augustine's footsteps, St. Leo says that power is given to princes "non ad solum mundi regimen, sed maxime ad Ecclesiae praesidium";[252] St. Fulgentius declares that the Christian emperor must make use of his authority for "the peace and tranquillity of the Church";[253] and St. Gregory, that God in granting power to those who rule, intends "ut qui bona appetunt adiuventur, ut caelorum via largius pateat, ut terrestre regnum caelesti regno famuletur."[254] St. Isidore speaks in like manner.[255]

[251] Cf. Gelasius, *Epist.* VIII: "Duo quippe sunt, imperator auguste, quibus principaliter mundus hic regitur, auctoritas sacra pontificum et regalis potestas. In quibus tanto gravius est pondus sacerdotum, quanto etiam pro ipsis regibus Domino in divino reddituri sunt examine rationem" (*P. L.*, LIX, 42).

[252] *Epist.* CLVI, 3; cf. CXI, 1; CLXIV, 1; CLXV, 10.

[253] *De verit. praedest.*, II, 38.

[254] *Epist.* III, 65; col. 663.

[255] *Sentent.*, III, 51, 4.

Protection of the Church by the State implied the forcible suppression of heresies and schisms. This consequence, which, as we saw, had been accepted by St. Augustine, is also accepted by later authors. St. Leo teaches that the emperor is in duty bound to check the intrigues of obstinate heretics who threaten civil and religious tranquillity.[256] St. Gregory calls upon the prefect Pantaleon not to tolerate the deeds of violence of the Donatists,[257] and St. Isidore lays down the principle that "saepe per regnum terrenum caeleste regnum proficit, ut qui intra Ecclesiam positi contra fidem et disciplinam Ecclesiae agunt rigore principum conterantur." [258]

§ 8. The Sacraments. Baptism. Confirmation.

St. Augustine defined a sacrament as a sensible sign of grace, a rite which signifies, and, when performed under certain conditions, infallibly produces grace. This idea was adopted by St. Isidore. Repeating St. Augustine's definition in his LVth letter to Januarius, n. 2, he declared that a sacrament consists of a ceremony, which is the sign of a thing that must be received in a holy manner: "Sacramentum est in aliqua celebratione cum res gesta ita fit ut aliquid significare intellegatur, quod sancte accipiendum est." [259] But he wrongly sought the etymology of *sacramentum* in

[256] *Epist.* CXVIII, 1. The XVth letter (col. 679, 680) seems to approve the severe measures that had been taken against Priscillian and his followers. But that letter is of doubtful authenticity.

[257] *Epist.* IV, 34. As to the pagans who have recourse to haruspices and witchcraft, St. Gregory demands that those who are slaves be punished "verberibus cruciatibusque," and the freemen "inclusione digna districtaque," in order that they may recover the health of their souls (*Epist.* IX, 65; cf. IV, 25, 26; V, 8). In other passages, however, concerning the Jews, he suggests persuasion and meekness (*Epist.* I, 35, 47; IX, 6).

[258] *Sentent.*, III, 51, 5; cf. 6.

[259] *Etymol.*, VI, 19, 39.

the word *secretum;* this led him to compare a sacrament, strictly so called, to a mystery, thereby sacrificing to some extent the precision of the Augustinian definition: "Sunt autem sacramenta baptismus et chrisma, corpus et sanguis. Quae ob id sacramenta dicuntur quia sub tegumento corporalium rerum virtus divina secretius salutem eorumdem sacramentorum operatur, unde et a *secretis* virtutibus et a *sacris* sacramenta dicuntur. . . . unde et graece mysterium dicitur, quod secretam et reconditam habeat dispositionem." [260]

The reader may have noticed that in this text St. Isidore distinguishes the sacramental or external rite from that which it signifies and the *salvation* effected therein (*salutem eorumdem sacramentorum*). In number 41, he calls the grace of salvation the *effect* of the sacrament: "Quae [sacramenta] ideo fructuose penes Ecclesiam fiunt quia sanctus in ea manens Spiritus eumdem sacramentorum latenter operatur effectum." This is the *res* or *virtus sacramenti* of St. Augustine. Hence, for St. Isidore as well as for St. Augustine, a sacrament consists of two things,— the rite and the grace that follows therefrom as an effect.

Concerning the parts of the rite itself, *elementum* and *verbum,* which had been illustrated by St. Augustine, we find no theoretical exposition of it in our authors, although they were certainly acquainted with it in practice. Theoretically they adhered to the rather material concept of a sacrament which had been held by Tertullian, St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine, and which ascribed to the matter (water in baptism, oil in confirmation, etc.) some sort of purifying and sanctifying efficacy, because of the blessing it had previously received. That blessing is supposed to bring down upon the baptismal water the Holy Spirit, who imparts to it

[260] *Etymol.,* VI, 19, 39, 40, 42.

the power of regeneration, or who works regeneration in it and through it. St. Leo writes: "Omni homini renascenti aqua baptismatis instar est uteri virginalis, eodem Spiritu sancto replente fontem qui replevit et virginem, ut peccatum quod ibi vacuavit sacra conceptio, hic mystica tollat ablutio." [261] Maximus of Turin briefly outlines the same theory.[262] St. Isidore states it plainly as follows: "Invocato enim Deo, descendit Spiritus sanctus de caelis, et medicatis aquis, sanctificat eas de semetipso; et accipiunt vim purgationis, ut in eis et caro et anima delictis inquinata mundetur." [263] That invocation of God is not the Trinitarian formula; it is the formula of the blessing of the water, which is deemed very important for the efficacy of the sacrament: "Nisi nomine et cruce ligni Christi fontis aquae tangantur, nullum salvationis remedium obtinetur." [264]

The texts which we have quoted enable us to realize how the writers of that period generally conceived sacramental efficacy. As we shall show later on in connection with baptism, the efficacy of a sacrament comes neither from the faith and holiness of the minister, nor from the dispositions of the subject, but from the rite itself. However, in and under the rite it is the virtue of Jesus Christ or of the Holy Ghost that is at work and produces the sacramental effect. St. Isidore says: "Sub tegumento corporalium rerum virtus divina secretius salutem eorumdem sacramentorum operatur. . . . Quae [sacramenta] ideo fructuose penes Ecclesiam fiunt quia sanctus in ea manens Spiritus sanctus eumdem sacramentorum latenter operatur effectum." [265]

[261] *Sermo* XXIV, 3.
[262] *Sermo* XIII, col. 558.
[263] *Etymol.*, VI, 19, 49.
[264] St. Ildefonsus, *De cogn. bapt.* CIX; cf. *Sermo ad catechumenos*, 3, (*P. L.*, XL, col. 694).
[265] Cf. Maximus of Turin, *Sermo* XIII, col. 557, 558.

In the stress thus laid on the teaching that sacraments are received fruitfully in the Church because the Holy Ghost abides in her, it is easy to find an echo of St. Augustine, who held that baptism could not be received *salubriter* outside the true Church, even in case of good faith, because that Church alone possesses the Holy Spirit and is the dispenser of all graces;[266] — an opinion that tended to decrease somewhat the intrinsic value of the rite itself. It was probably in order to maintain that value that St. Bede parted company with the Bishop of Hippo on this particular point and taught that, in case of good faith, one could fruitfully receive baptism outside the Church, though not without the obligation of joining the true Church as soon as one comes to know her.[267] This was tantamount to saying that the sacramental rite produces its whole effect even when performed by an unlawful minister.

The quasi-official list of the sacraments remains the same as before: "Sunt autem sacramenta," writes St. Isidore, "baptismus et chrisma, corpus et sanguis."[268] These are the rites of Christian initiation. St. Leo speaks also of the sacrament of the priesthood,[269] and Salvian, of the *connubii sacramenta*.[270] But we must not attach too much importance to these expressions, because of the still prevailing indefiniteness of the notion of a sacrament.[271] The fact that a rite or a state is called a sacrament, does not prove that that particular rite or state was deemed a sacrament in the modern sense of the term.

[266] Cf. vol. II, p. 400, 401.
[267] *Hexaemeron*, II, col. 101.
[268] *Etymol.*, VI, 19, 39.
[269] *Epist.* XII, 3.
[270] *De gubernatione Dei*, IV, 5.
[271] Add also the numerous meanings of the Latin word *sacramentum*. St. Leo always speaks of the Incarnation as a *sacramentum*.

St. Ildefonsus has left us a treatise *De cognitione baptismi,* the substance of which is probably much older, and which gives a minute description of the ceremonies that accompanied the conferring of baptism in Spain. This is not, however, our only source of information.

In the first place, Christian baptism was clearly distinguished from the baptism of St. John. The latter does not by itself remit sins, the former does; John's baptism was conferred by a man, ours is conferred by Christ, its chief minister.[272]

In the new baptism, the candidate was plunged three times into the water, except in Spain, where, through hatred of Arianism and for the purpose of affirming the divine unity, one immersion was deemed sufficient.[273] The immersion was accompanied by the Trinitarian formula, which was looked upon as absolutely necessary. The omission of the name of one of the three divine Persons nullified baptism.[274] However the question as to the value of the baptism conferred *in nomine Iesu* was still raised, and, whilst St. Fulgentius declines to answer it,[275] the author of the *De Trinitate,* probably Vigilius of Tapsus, admits the validity of the baptism in the name of Jesus, because the names of the Father and the Holy Ghost are included in that of Jesus.[276]

The effect of baptism is to wash away original sin, and generally all sins, and to give grace and supernatural life.[277]

[272] Maximus of Turin, *Sermo* XIII, col. 557; St. Greg., *In evangel. homil.* XX, 2; Bede, *Homil.* I, 3, col. 22.

[273] *Concil. Toletan.* IV, 6, held in 633 (Mansi, X, 618). St. Martin of Braga, in his book *De trina mersione,* had opposed the Spanish custom as smacking of Sabellianism; but St. Gregory declared it to be legitimate, "quia in una fide nihil officit sanctae Ecclesiae consuetudo diversa." Cf. St. Ildefonsus, *De cogn. bapt.,* CXVII.

[274] St. Fulgentius, *Epist.* VIII, 19; St. Ildef., *De cogn. bapt.,* CXII.

[275] *Contra Fabianum,* fragm. XXXVII, col. 830–832.

[276] *De Trinitate,* XII, col. 324.

[277] Maximus of Tur., *Homil.* XCVIII, col. 481, 482; *Sermo* XVII, col. 567; St. Fulg., *Epist.* XII, 18; St. Greg., *Epist.* XI, 45, col. 1162.

It has been justly remarked that, after St. Augustine, to whom the doctrine of original sin owes its development, the function of baptism as cleansing men from that sin, is especially emphasized by the theologians of that time at the expense of its other function as the sacrament of Christian initiation. St. Gregory teaches[278] that original sin before Jesus Christ was washed away, in the case of children, by mere faith, and in the case of adults, by the virtue of sacrifice, or (in the case of the descendants of Abraham) by circumcision. But now baptism is necessary for that purpose; it cannot be replaced except by martyrdom, which is in itself a perfect baptism.[279]

The ordinary minister of baptism was the bishop, assisted by priests and deacons. In case of necessity only, clerics of lower orders and laymen were allowed to baptize.[280]

The question of the validity of baptism when administered by heretics remained very practical in the West, as a result of the mixture of the Arian invaders with the Catholic population. It was fully settled by the decisions of the Church and the authority of St. Augustine, St. Leo, St. Gregory, Gennadius, St. Fulgentius, St. Isidore, and St. Ildefonsus, who all agree in teaching that the baptism conferred by heretics in the name of the Trinity must not be repeated.[281] This does not mean that it is looked upon as

[278] *Moral.*, IV, praef., cap. III, col. 635; cf. Bede, *Hexaem.*, IV, col. 163, 185; *Homil.* I, 10, col. 54.

[279] Maximus of Tur., *Sermo* LXXXVIII, col. 708, 709; Gennadius, *De eccl. dogm.*, 74; St. Greg., *Moral.*, IV, praef., cap. III, col. 635.

[280] Cf. St. Ildef., *De cogn. bapt.*, CXVI.

[281] St. Leo, *Epist.* CLIX, 7; St. Greg., *Epist.* XI, 67; Gennad., *De eccl. dogm.*, 52; St. Fulg., *De fide*, 41; *Contra Fabian.*, fragm. XXIX, col. 795; St. Isid., *De eccl. offic.*, II, 25, 9; St. Ildef., *De cogn. bapt.*, CXXI. The reader will notice that, like St. Augustine, these last two authors justify that solution by the doctrine of the character: "Character est enim regis mei: non ero sacrilegus si corrigo desertorem et non muto characterem" (St. Isid., *loc. cit.*, 10).

fruitful and effective in wiping out sins. As we saw, St. Isidore seems to admit the Augustinian view that the sacrament, even when received in good faith, is inefficacious. This is also apparently the sentiment of St. Fulgentius when he writes: "Baptismus autem extra Ecclesiam quidem esse potest, sed nisi intra Ecclesiam prodesse non potest." [282]

One who, after being baptized in heresy, came back to the Church, had to be reconciled by a special rite which, as it were, completed his baptism. As has been said before, this rite for a long time seems to have been identical with confirmation. However, St. Augustine had made a distinction between the two; [283] and, as a matter of fact, the rite of reconciliation was distinguished from confirmation in the countries that followed the Roman practice, and reconciliation was effected by the imposition of the hand only. This is expressly declared by St. Gregory: "Unde arianos per impositionem manus occidens, per unctionem vero sancti chrismatis ad ingressum sanctae Ecclesiae catholicae oriens reformat." [284] But "the West" here referred to must be taken in a very restricted sense, for in Gaul, Spain, and Upper Italy (*i. e.*, in the countries of the Gallican rite) the ceremony of reconciliation comprised anointment with chrism and the laying on of hand, in other words, the whole rite of confirmation. "Haeretici autem," St. Isidore writes, "si tamen in Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti attestatione docentur baptisma suscepisse, non iterum baptizandi, sed solo chrismate et manus impositione purgandi sunt." [285] Even where the imposition of the hand was the

[282] *De fide*, 41.

[283] Cf. vol. II, p. 407, note 289.

[284] *Epist.* XI, 67, col. 1205, 1206.

[285] *De eccles. offic.*, II, 25, 9. Gennadius seems to identify the two rites, for he says of adults capable of professing the faith: "Confirmatur manus impositione," whilst he demands that children and

only ceremony, its purpose was to impart the Holy Ghost. "Qui baptismum ab haereticis acceperunt," says St. Leo, ". . . sola invocatione Spiritus sancti per impositionem manuum confirmandi sunt, quia formam tantum baptismi sine sanctificationis virtute sumpserunt." [286] The idea that inspired this custom is clearly brought out by the same Pope. Heretics can validly perform the baptismal rite, the *forma baptismi,* but they cannot impart its effect, nor confer the Holy Ghost, and this is why those whom they have baptized "baptizandi non sunt, sed per manus impositionem, invocata virtute Spiritus sancti, quam ab haereticis accipere non potuerunt, catholicis copulandi sunt." [287]

Baptism was as a rule immediately followed by confirmation. The rite of the latter sacrament, which was substantially identical in all parts of the Latin Church, consisted of the imposition of the hand, accompanied by the invocation of the Holy Spirit and the anointment of the forehead or head with perfumed oil or chrism, with an appropriate formula.[288] It had for its effect to confer the Holy Ghost; but, although that effect is usually attributed to each part of the rite,[289] at times our authors seem to ascribe it particularly to the imposition of the hand, whereas they ascribe to the unction the conferring of a spiritual royalty and

weak-minded adults be "manus impositione et chrismate communiti" (*De eccles. dogm.,* 52).

[286] *Epist.* CLIX, 7. On the whole subject, cf. L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien,* p. 325–328 (English transl., p. 338–341).

[287] *Epist.* CLXVII, inquisit. 18; CLXVI, 2.

[288] In the Roman rite, there was a twofold unction, one upon the head of the neophyte by the priest before the imposition of the hand (*chrismatio*); the other, following the imposition of the hand, and made by the bishop on the forehead (*consignatio*). The Gallican and Milanese rites knew only the former. Cf. L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrét.* p. 302, 303 (English transl., p. 314, 315).

[289] For instance, cf. St. Isidore, *Etymol.,* VI, 19, 51, 54; St. Ildef., *De cogn. bapt.,* CXXIV, CXXVIII, CXXIX.

priesthood upon the recipient, according to *I Petri* II, 9: "Caput vestrum chrismate, id est oleo sanctificationis infundimus, per quod ostenditur baptizatis regalem et sacerdotalem conferri a Domino dignitatem."[290] Both ceremonies were reserved to the bishop: "Hoc autem solis pontificibus deberi," writes St. Isidore, following Pope Innocent I, "ut vel consignent, vel ut Paracletum Spiritum tradant";[291] because, as had been already declared by the same Pope, "presbyteri, licet secundi sint sacerdotes, pontificatus tamen apicem non habent."[292] However, in Gaul and Spain, ordinary priests were at times allowed to give confirmation.[293] St. Gregory granted that faculty to the priests of Sardinia, when there was no bishop available to perform the ceremony.[294] But in confirming, priests were obliged to use oil consecrated by a bishop.[295]

§ 9. The Eucharist.

We have seen, in the second volume of this work, how forcibly the Latin tradition of the 4th century proclaimed the real presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist. St. Augustine had pushed his investigations still further and tried to define the sacramental mode of existence and action of the sacred body and blood. He had depicted it to himself as a mode of existence very similar to that of spirits,

[290] St. Maximus of Tur., *Tract.* III, *De baptismo.* col. III, 778; St. Isid., *De eccles. offic.*, II, 26, 2; 27, 1; cf. St. Ildef., *De cogn. bapt.*, CXXIII. This view implies belief in the sacramental character.

[291] *De eccles. offic.*, II, 27, 4; cf. 1; St. Ildef., *De cogn. bapt.*, CXXXI.

[292] *Epist.* XXV, 3; cf. St. Isid., *De eccles. offic.*, II, 27, 3; St. Ildef., *De cogn. bapt.*, CXXXI.

[293] Cf. Councils of Orange (441), can. 1 and 2 (Mansi, VI, 435); of Epaon (517), can. 16 (Mansi, VIII, 561); Toledo (400), can. 20 (Mansi, III, 1002).

[294] *Epist.* IV, 26, col. 696; cf. IV, 9, col. 677.

[295] Council of Toledo, *supra cit.*; St. Isid., *De eccles. offic.*, II, 27, 4; St. Ildef., *De cognit. Bapt.*, CXXXI.

and again as a mode of action, the term of which was mainly spiritual and the principle, the vivifying spirit of Jesus Christ, glorious and impassible. But this explanation detracted in no way from the previous affirmation of the reality of the body and blood; *spiritual* was not opposed to *real*. This was St. Augustine's meaning, and it was thus understood and accepted by the authors who wrote from the 5th to the 8th century. Some of them, like St. Leo,[296] Salvianus,[297] Faustus of Riez,[298] St. Gregory,[299] and Bede,[300] merely proclaim the faith of the Church and abstain from speculation; others, like the African Fulgentius,[301] reproduce with marked fondness the Augustinian explanation of the symbolism of the Eucharist and its quality of spiritual food; others again do not shrink from combining the two viewpoints and thus tempering, as it were, both the materialistic tendency of pure realism and the rather indefinite and frail position of exclusive spiritualism. We find a rather unskillful specimen of that proceeding in chapters CXXXVI–CXXXVIII of the *De cognitione baptismi* of St. Ildefonsus, who simply follows the exposition of the ecclesiastical teaching with the Augustinian commentaries. On the contrary,

[296] *Sermo* XCI, 3: "Sic sacrae mensae communicare debetis, ut nihil prorsus de veritate corporis Christi et sanguinis ambigatis. Hoc enim ore sumitur quod fide creditur." St. Leo sees in the reality of Christ's eucharistic body an argument against Monophysitism; cf. *ibid.*, 2; *Epist.* LIX, 2.

[297] *Adv. avaritiam,* II, 6. Notice these forcible contrasts: "Iudaei manna manducaverunt, nos Christum; Iudaei carnes avium, nos corpus Dei; Iudaei pruinam caeli, nos Deum caeli."

[298] Cf. the *Homilia V de Paschate* (*P. L.,* LXVII, 1052), which is probably his work.

[299] *Moral.,* XXII, 26; *In evangel. homil.* XIV, 1; XXII, 7.

[300] *In Marcum,* cap. XIV, col. 272; *In Lucam,* cap. XXII, col. 596; *Homil.,* II, 4, col. 151. The reader may consult also St. Isidore, *De eccles. offic.,* I, 18, 3. I shall not use here the VIIth letter ascribed to St. Isidore (*P. L.,* LXXXIII, 905), as its authenticity is extremely doubtful.

[301] Cf. especially *Contra Fabianum,* fragm. XXVIII, col. 789–791.

we find a very felicitous instance of the same proceeding in these lines of Cassiodore: "Corpus et sanguinem suum [Salvator] in panis et vini erogatione salutariter consecravit. . . . Sed in carne ista ac sanguine nil cruentum, nil corruptibile mens humana concipiat . . . sed vivificatricem substantiam atque salutarem, et ipsius Verbi propriam factam, per quam peccatorum remissio et aeternae vitae dona praestantur."[302] This proceeding is often met with in liturgical texts of that period. Side by side with the expressions, to eat and receive the body and drink the blood of Jesus Christ, run such others as *cibus, panis, mensa caelestis, spiritales epulae, poculum spiritale,*[303] which, whilst they do not contradict the former, emphasize the suprasensible character of the divine food dispensed in the Eucharist.

The 4th century had not only affirmed the real presence; it had also taught, through St. Ambrose and the author of the *De sacramentis,* that that presence is effected by the change (conversion) of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. This teaching is also that of the period we are now studying. It is repeated as a matter of course, as it were, without further explanation or discussion, and implied in the current formulas. In Spain, prayer is made to God to conform the *oblata* to the Lord's body and blood *plena transformatione.*[304] In France, the celebrant asks that the bread be transformed into Christ's body, and the chalice into His blood (*translata fruge in corpore, calice in cruore*); the liturgy speaks of *panem mutatum in carne, poculum versum in sanguine;*[305] and St. Germanus of Paris (+ 575–577) explains that "panis in corpore et vinum

[302] *In psalm.* CIX, vers. 5. Cf. *In psalm.* LXIV, vers. 12.

[303] Cf. the texts quoted by Batifol, *Etudes d'hist. et de théol. posit.,* 2ème série, 3ème édition, p. 341 and foll.

[304] *Missale mixtum* (*P. L.,* LXXXV, col. 250).

[305] *Missale gothicum* (VIth or VIIth century), *P. L.,* LXXII, col. 246, 317; cf. 237.

transformatur in sanguinem dicente Domino de corpore suo: *Caro enim mea vere est cibus et sanguis meus vere est potus.*" [306] In England, St. Bede writes, with less precision: "Panis et vini creatura in sacramentum carnis et sanguinis eius [Christi] ineffabili Spiritus sanctificatione transfertur." [307] The doctrine of the eucharistic conversion grows stronger since its embodiment in the liturgy. To these testimonies some scholars oppose that of Pope St. Gelasius, who, in his treatise *De duabus naturis in Christo adversus Eutychen et Nestorium,*[308] attempts to prove against the Monophysites that Christ's human and divine natures preserve their proper essence in the hypostatic union, and in proof of his assertion appeals to the Eucharist. He argues as follows: The sacraments of Christ's body and blood, which we receive, are certainly a divine thing (divina res est); *et tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis et vini.* The Eucharist is an image of the Incarnation; now, in the sacred mysteries the eucharistic elements *in hanc, scilicet in divinam transeunt, sancto Spiritu perficiente, substantiam, permanentes tamen in suae proprietate naturae;* hence, in that chief mystery, of which the Eucharist is the image, and "of which it truly represents to us the efficacy and virtue," both the human and divine natures preserve their own proper being in the one Christ.[309] In order

[306] *Exposit. brevis liturg. gallic.* (*P. L.*, LXXII, 93). Cf. also Faustus, *Homilia V^a de Paschate,* col. 1053.

[307] *Homil.* I, 14, col. 75.

[308] Text in Thiel, *Epistolae romanorum pontificum genuinae.*— The reader will notice that the sentence "et in obsequium plebis tuae panem et vinum in corpus et sanguinem Filii tui immaculata benedictione transforment [presbyteri]," attested in the Roman liturgy by the *Missale francorum* and the Gelasian sacramentary, is really of Gallican origin. Cf. *Bulletin d'anc. littérat. et d'archéologie chrétiennes,* I (1911), p. 55.

[309] The whole text is as follows: "Certe sacramenta quae sumimus corporis et sanguinis Christi divina res est, propter quod et per eadem

that this argument may be conclusive, it evidently does not suffice that the minor affirms that the accidents, species and appearances, are preserved in the Eucharist — for the Monophysites did not deny that Jesus Christ appeared externally as a man — it must also be affirmed that the eucharistic elements, once they have been consecrated, even when "they pass into a divine substance," preserve their proper nature of bread and wine, and that is apparently what Gelasius says: "esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis et vini . . . permanentes tamen in suae proprietate naturae." Some have tried to interpret his words in a more favorable light.[310] As a matter of fact, they may be thus explained, but the difficulty can be more readily overcome by means of this consideration: Gelasius does not give his own teaching, nor that of Rome or the Latins; he is merely setting down, in a controversial work, and not very cautiously, considerations urged by others. It is well known that the treatise *De duabus naturis* depends on Greek, and particularly on

divinae efficimur consortes naturae; et tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis et vini. Et certe imago et similitudo corporis et sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrantur. Satis ergo nobis evidenter ostenditur hoc nobis in ipso Christo domino sentiendum, quod in eius imagine profitemur, celebramus et sumimus: ut sicut in hanc, scilicet in divinam transeunt, sancto Spiritu perficiente, substantiam, permanentes tamen in suae proprietate naturae; sic illud ipsum mysterium principale, cuius nobis efficientiam virtutemque veraciter repraesentant, ex quibus constat proprie permanentibus, unum Christum, quia integrum verumque, permanere demonstrant" (Thiel, *op. cit.*, p. 541, § 14).

On this question, cf. J. Lebreton, *Le dogme de la transsubstantiation et la christologie antiochienne du V*ème *siècle*, in *Etudes*, tom. CXVII (1908), p. 477–497.

[310] *Ita* Lebreton, *loc. cit.*; G. Rauschen, *Eucharistie und Bussakrament*, p. 25, 26 (English translation, p. 29–30) and J. Nirschl, *Lehrbuch der Patrologie*, III, p. 329, note 2. That the eucharistic elements "pass into a divine substance," and at the same time persevere in their own nature, seems to be a contradiction.

Antiochian sources.[311] Moreover, the argument formulated by Gelasius recurs in Theodoret's *Eranistes* and in the pseudo-Chrysostom's letter to Cæsarius.[312] Besides, the attribution of the transformation of the *oblata* to the Holy Ghost [313] evidently betrays a borrowing from Greek sources. Hence we may conclude that the lines cited from Gelasius' treatise do not express either the Pope's personal view or the Latin tradition, but are merely an extemporized and hasty reproduction of one of the leading arguments used by Oriental theologians against Monophysitism.

Gelasius was not the only one who, through fear of favoring heresy, showed little favor to the idea of a conversion of the eucharistic elements. The writings of Facundus of Hermiane contain a passage which gives rise to similar difficulties.[314]

As has been said elsewhere, it is to the words of Jesus, spoken at the last supper, that, in the 4th century, the consecration of the bread and wine and the real presence were ascribed. A casual observer might believe that, after the 5th century, there was some sort of hesitation on this subject in parts of the Latin Church. We notice first, the gradual spread of the Greek view that the sanctification of the *oblata* is the work of the Holy Ghost. Then, liturgical usage becomes divided. By the side of the Roman liturgy there grow up the liturgies of Gallican type, which are derived from Oriental liturgies, and, as a rule, contain the

[311] L. Saltet, *Les sources de l'Eranistes de Théodoret,* p. 52 and foll.

[312] Cf. above, p. 239–241. Mgr. Batiffol has found it also in the *Confutationes* of Eutherius of Tyana (*P. G.,* XXVIII, 1337–1393), composed between 431 and 433 (*Revue du Clergé français,* vol. LX (1909), p. 530–534).

[313] "In divinam transeunt, sancto Spiritu perficiente, substantiam."

[314] *Pro defensione trium capitulorum,* IX, 5 (*P. L.,* LXVII, 762, 763).

epiclesis. The formulas of the epiclesis may have directly suggested the notion just referred to; at all events, they could not but strengthen it; nay, because of their tenor and the place they hold after the words of institution, they almost of necessity suggest the thought that the consecration of the eucharistic elements was to be ascribed to the epiclesis only or to the Holy Ghost invoked in the epiclesis. Neither St. Fulgentius nor St. Isidore seems to have altogether escaped that danger. Asking himself why, in the offering of the sacrifice, the Church earnestly prays for the descent of the Holy Ghost only "ad sanctificandum oblationis nostrae munus," the former answers among other things: "Quando autem congruentius quam ad consecrandum sacrificium corporis Christi sancta Ecclesia (quae corpus est Christi) Spiritus sancti deposcat adventum? quae caput suum secundum carnem de Spiritu sancto noverit natum." [315] St. Isidore, speaking of the epiclesis of the Mozarabic Mass, called *conformatio,* writes: "Exhinc succedit conformatio sacramenti, ut oblatio quae Deo offertur, sanctificata per Spiritum sanctum, Christi corpori ac sanguini conformetur"; [316] and a little farther on: "Haec autem [*scil.* panis et vinum] dum sunt visibilia, sanctificata tamen per Spiritum sanctum, in sacramentum divini corporis transeunt." [317] In other words, the change of the *oblata,* which results from the *sanctification* of the Holy Ghost, takes place in the *conformatio* or epiclesis.

In spite of such testimonies, however, it would be an error to believe that this opinion was common in the West, even in the countries that followed the Gallican liturgy. In proof of this statement we point to the fact that in many

[315] *Ad Monimum,* II, 6, 10, col. 184, 188.

[316] *De eccles. offic.,* I, 15, 3.

[317] *Ibid.,* I, 18, 4. As has been already remarked, the VIIth letter to Redemptus, ascribed to St. Isidore, need not be taken into account.

Masses of the Gallican rite that have been preserved, the *post secreta, post pridie* or *post mysterium* either presents a rather loosely jointed text or says nothing whatever of a future consecration of the offerings or of the person of the Holy Ghost.[318] Nay, it is not at all improbable that, in his explanation of the Gallican liturgy, St. Germanus of Paris ascribes the change of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ to the words of institution.[319] Evidently, the epiclesis had not the same importance in the West which it had in the East; and even though St. Ambrose's teaching on the consecratory formula of the Eucharist had paled in the works of some writers, yet, on the whole, it had lost none of its weight and was generally received: "Invisibilis sacerdos," writes Faustus, "visibiles creaturas in substantiam corporis et sanguinis sui verbi sui secreta potestate convertit, ita dicens: *Accipite et edite, hoc est corpus meum.*" [320]

Since the body and blood of Jesus are present in the Eucharist to serve as food for the faithful, they must be received from time to time. Our readers may recall that St. Augustine in his controversy against the Pelagians, had gone so far as to say that the reception of the Eucharist is absolutely necessary to all, even to children, that they may enter into eternal life, according to St. John VI, 54. St.

[318] Cf. L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien*, p. 207 (English transl., p. 217). Varaine, *L'epiclèse eucharistique*, Brignais, 1910, p. 105 and foll.

[319] "Sanguis vero Christi ideo specialiter offertur in calice, quia in tale vasum consecratum fuit mysterium eucharistiae, pridie quam pateretur Dominus, ipso dicente: *Hic est calix sanguinis mei mysterium fidei qui pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum* (*Matth.*, XXVI, 28). Panis vero in corpore et vinum transformatur in sanguine, dicente Domino de corpore suo: *Caro enim mea vere est cibus, et sanguis meus vere est potus* (*Ioann.*, VI, 56). De pane dixit: *Hoc est corpus meum*, et de vino: *Hic sanguis meus* (*Matth.*, XXVI, 26)." *Exposit. brev. ant. liturg. gallic.*, col. 93.

[320] *Homil. V^a de Paschate*, col. 1053.

Fulgentius realized that this was an exaggeration and set it right by teaching that children sufficiently complied with Christ's precept by becoming His members through baptism (*de ossibus eius*) and joining His mystical body, which is the Church.[321] As to the frequency of communion, whilst the principles did not change, the practice, of course, varied according to places and peoples. Like St. Augustine, St. Isidore teaches that one can communicate daily, if he is free from grievous sins and receives the sacrament "cum religione et devotione et humilitate."[322] Gennadius practically endorses this view and, moreover, insists that every Christian should receive communion at least on Sunday.[323] We notice the same insistence on the part of St. Maximus of Turin.[324] Sunday communion was practised at Cassian's monastery of St. Victor at Marseilles. Cassian himself reproves some monks in other monasteries, who communicated but once a year under the pretext of better preparing themselves for that great action and being less unworthy of the body of the Lord.[325] In course of time custom, and then councils and bishops, designated special days or periods when communion was obligatory. St. Leo evidently supposes that all Christians communicate at Easter;[326] St. Cæsarius, that all receive at Easter and Christmas;[327] and a council of Agde, in the year 506, charges those who do not approach the holy table at Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost, with apostasy.[328] This last rule seems to have been the starting

[321] *Epist.* XII, 24–26.
[322] *De eccles. offic.*, I, 18, 7, 8.
[323] *De eccles. dogm.*, 53.
[324] *Sermo* XCIII, col. 719, 720.
[325] *Collat.* XXIII, 21.
[326] *Sermo* L, 1, 2.
[327] *Sermo* CXVI, 2; X, 5 (*P. L.*, XXXIX, 1975, 1760).
[328] Canon 18 (Mansi, VIII, 327).

point of the subsequent canonical legislation in the matter.[329]

But, however they may differ with regard to the frequency of communion, the authors of whom we are speaking all demand due preparation therefor, consisting in purity of heart and freedom from the more grievous sins. At the approach of great solemnities, St. Leo, St. Gregory and St. Cæsarius, in their sermons, exhort the people to do penance and prepare their souls by giving up sin: "Qui sacramentum suae reparationis intellegit carnis se vitiis debet exuere et omnes sordes abiicere peccatorum, ut intraturus nuptiale convivium, splendeat veste virtutum."[330] Venial and daily faults are not an obstacle to communion, because communion is chiefly "propter animae medicinam et purificationem spiritus";[331] but, even then, they must be regretted and wiped away by penance.

This purifying and medicinal action is the first effect of communion. The Eucharist makes us "sanctos et immaculatos."[332] As regards its special and deeper effect, St. Leo has left a very significant sentence: "Non enim aliud agit participatio corporis et sanguinis Christi quam ut in id quod sumimus transeamus, et in quo commortui et consepulti et conresuscitati sumus, ipsum per omnia et spiritu et carne gestemus."[333]

It is mainly from the practical point of view that the doc-

[329] For further details, cf. A. Villien, *Histoire des commandements de l'Eglise,* Paris, 1909, p. 187 and foll. (English transl., St. Louis, 1915).

[330] St. Leo, *Sermo* L, 1; Gennadius, *De eccles. dogm.,* 53.

[331] Cassian, *Collat.* XXIII, 21, col. 1279. Regarding the conjugal act as an obstacle to communion, cf. St. Gregory, *Epist.* XI, 64, col. 1197.

[332] Cassian, *ibid.*

[333] *Sermo* LXIII, 7 Cf. Faustus, *Homil. V^a de Paschate,* col. 1053, 1054.

trine of the Eucharist as a sacrifice developed during the period which we are now studying. That the Mass is a sacrifice, of which Jesus Christ is both priest and victim, is affirmed more and more explicitly. What is more venerable, exclaims St. Maximus of Turin, than the altar, "in qua Deo sacrificium celebratur . . . in qua Dominus est sacerdos . . . super aram Christus imponitur . . . super altare Domini corpus offertur . . . pro peccatoribus Christi sanguis effunditur . . . mors Domini quotidie celebratur . . . occisionis dominicae membra ponuntur . . . hostia Christus est et sacerdos." [334] The Mass is a sacrifice prefigured by that of Melchisedech,[335] and instituted by Jesus Christ [336] as a perpetual commemoration of His passion and death: "In isto autem sacrificio gratiarum actio atque commemoratio est carnis Christi quam pro nobis obtulit, et sanguinis quem pro nobis idem Deus effudit." [337] Hence it is not only commemorative, but a real sacrifice, because the victim is present and really immolated on the altar. St. Germanus of Paris bears witness to this teaching in his explanation of the Gallican Mass, in connection with the breaking of the consecrated bread: "Confractio vero et commixtio corporis Domini tantis mysteriis declarata antiquitus sanctis Patribus fuit, ut dum sacerdos oblationem confrangeret, videbatur quasi angelus Dei membra fulgentis pueri cultro concaedere, et sanguinem eius in calicem excipiendo colligere, ut veracius dicerent verbum dicente Domino carnem eius esse cibum et sanguinis esse potum." [338]

[334] *Sermo* LXXVII, col. 689, 690; St. Leo, *Sermo* LIX, 7; Cassiodorus, *In psalm.* XIX, vers. 3.

[335] Bede, *Hexaemeron,* III, col. 151.

[336] St. Isidore, *De eccles. offic.,* I, 18, 1.

[337] St. Fulgent., *De fide,* 60; *Contra Fabianum,* fragm. XXVIII, col. 789; Bede, *Homil.* I, 14, col. 75; *Missale gothicum, P. L.,* LXXII, 226.

[338] *Exposit. brev. liturg. gallic.,* col. 94.

The sacrifice of the Mass has for its first effect to wipe out the sins of the living. As at the last supper and on Calvary, Christ offers Himself on the altar "in remissionem peccatorum." "Lavat itaque nos [Christus] a peccatis nostris quotidie in sanguine suo, cum eiusdem beatae passionis ad altare memoria replicatur." [339] The Mass, secondly, washes away the sins of the dead and frees them from the punishments that they have still to suffer in the next life. The dogma of Purgatory, becoming more and more explicit during this period, naturally leads to a growing sense of the efficacy of the Mass as an expiatory and propitiatory sacrifice and a means of helping the souls of the departed. St. Gregory gave a decisive impulse in that direction mainly through his *Dialogues*. To a certain Peter asking: "Quidnam ergo esse poterit, quod mortuorum valeat animabus prodesse?" the Pope gives the following reply: "Si culpae post mortem insolubiles non sunt, multum solet animas etiam post mortem sacra oblatio hostiae salutaris adiuvare, ita ut hanc nonnunquam ipsae defunctorum animae expetere videantur." In proof of his assertion he goes on to relate two instances, the second of which is the origin of the devotion that has been called the Gregorian Trentain.[340] The suggestion was taken up and must have aided in introducing the custom, which makes its appearance about this time, of low or private Masses.[341]

But the Eucharistic sacrifice obtains not only the remission of sins for the living and the dead, but also, for the living, such other spiritual and even temporal blessings as they may

[339] Bede, *Homil.* I, 14, col. 75; *Hexaemer.*, III, col. 151; St. Maximus of Tur., *Sermo* LXXVII, col. 690; St. Greg., *In evang. homil.* XXXVII, 7.

[340] *Dialog.*, IV, 55; cf. 57.

[341] St. Chrodegang's (modified) rule (cap. LXXVII) denounces the custom of saying Mass without assistants, which tended to grow more and more common (*P. L.*, LXXXIX, col. 1089, 1090).

need. St. Gregory gives several instances of the efficacy of the Eucharist on behalf of the living as well as of the departed.[342]

Towards the end of his *Dialogues* occurs a passage that sums up quite well what has been said here of the Eucharist and may serve as a fitting conclusion of this section:

"Haec namque singulariter victima ab aeterno interitu animam salvat, quae illam nobis mortem Unigeniti per mysterium reparat, qui licet resurgens a mortuis, iam non moritur, et mors ei ultra non dominabitur, tamen in semetipso immortaliter atque incorruptibiliter vivens, pro nobis iterum in hoc mysterio sacrae oblationis immolatur. Eius quippe ibi corpus sumitur, eius caro in populi salutem partitur, eius sanguis non iam in manus infidelium, sed in ora fidelium funditur. Hinc ergo pensemus quale sit pro nobis hoc sacrificium, quod pro absolutione nostra passionem unigeniti Filii semper imitatur. Quis enim fidelium habere dubium possit, in ipsa immolationis hora, ad sacerdotis vocem caelos aperiri, in illo Iesu Christi mysterio angelorum choros adesse, summis ima sociari, terrena caelestibus iungi, unumque ex visibilibus atque invisibilibus fieri? Sed necesse est ut cum haec agimus, nosmetipsos Deo in cordis contritione mactemus, quia qui passionis dominicae mysteria celebramus, debemus imitari quod agimus. Tunc ergo vere pro nobis hostia erit Deo, cum nos ipsos hostiam fecerimus." [343]

§ 10. Penance.[344]

During the period from the 5th to the 8th century the penitential discipline experienced certain important trans-

[342] *Dialog.*, IV, 57; III, 3; *In evangel. homil.* XXXVII, 8.

[343] *Dialog.*, IV, 58, 59.

[344] On this sacrament cf. especially: A. Boudinhon, *Sur l'histoire de la pénitence*, in the *Revue d'hist. et de littér. religieuses*, II (1897), p. 496 and foll. E. Vacandard, article *Confession* in the *Dictionn. de théol. catholique*. P. Batiffol, *Etudes d'hist. et de théologie positive*, 1st series, 3d edit., Paris, 1904, p. 145–194. F. Loofs, *Leitfaden zum Studium der DG.*, 4th edit., § 59 (p. 475 and foll.). A. Wasserschleben,

formations which we must study in detail. Let us begin by recalling briefly the state of that discipline at the time of St. Augustine's death.[345]

Penance is necessary to obtain forgiveness of the more grievous sins committed after baptism: not only for the three faults *ad mortem* (apostasy, murder, adultery), but generally for those which we now call *mortal,* of which St. Augustine says that they who commit them cannot, according to the Apostle, enter into the kingdom of heaven.

The *actio paenitentiae* implies first a secret and detailed accusation, then the performance of an expiatory act (exomologesis) imposed by the confessor, in proportion to the nature of the sin and the disposition of the penitent. Expiation is *plenary, solemn,* and *public,* when the sins, besides being very grave (*ita gravia*), are also of a scandalous character; this is the penance that is imposed especially for the three sins *ad mortem.* The penitent, clad in sackcloth and having received the imposition of the hand *in paenitentiam,* makes, as it were, the whole Christian community a party to his penance through his tears and supplications.[346]

Die Bussordnungen der abendländischen Kirche, Halle, 1851. H. J. Schmitz, *Die Bussbücher und die Bussdisciplin der Kirche,* Mayence, 1883; *Die Bussbücher und das kanonische Bussverfahren,* Düsseldorf, 1898. (These two volumes are quoted as volume I and II respectively of the same work, *Die Bussbücher*). P. Fournier, *Étude sur les pénitentiels,* in the *Revue d'hist. et de littér. relig.,* VI–IX (1901–1904). B. Brat, *Les livres pénitentiaux et la pénitence tarifée,* Brignais, 1910. A. Malnory, *Quid Luxovienses monachi, discipuli sancti Columbani, ad regulam monasteriorum atque ad communem ecclesiae profectum contulerint,* Parisiis, 1894.

[345] As we are concerned with the history of dogmas, not with that of ecclesiastical discipline, we shall not enter into all the details that would have to be presented in a history of the penitential discipline. Our readers will excuse the length of this section of our treatise because of the importance of its subject matter and the complexity of the elements that have to be taken into account.

[346] As to whether or not the penitent was excluded from the Church, cf. A. Boudinhon, *La missa paenitentium dans l'ancienne*

When the sins are not so grave, or have remained more or less secret, the expiation is accomplished by means of private and less severe exercises (*quibusdam correptionum medicamentis*).

The third part of the *actio paenitentiae* is the reconciliation. As there are no longer any reserved sins, the reconciliation is granted to all sinners, though not on the same conditions. Some, as, for instance, incontinent virgins consecrated to God, and monks, must do penance during their whole lives and are allowed to receive communion only at the point of death.[347] Others, who, after committing apostasy and idolatry, become repentant, are reconciled, but only at the point of death.[348] Lastly, others who are less guilty, are absolved on Maundy Thursday. Moreover, it remains fully understood that sinners can do penance at any time, even at the moment of death, and that, however short or even doubtful their expiation may then be, absolution and communion are not denied to them.[349]

Except at Rome where, since Pope Marcellus (304–309),[350] mere parish-priests were commissioned to hear confession, prescribe a proper penance, and see to its performance, and excepting necessity in danger of death, the *actio paenitentiae* in all its parts, was, in the West, at the beginning of the 5th century, reserved to the bishop. It was the

discipline d'Occident, in the *Revue d'hist. et de littér. relig.,* VII (1902), p. 1–20. P. Batiffol, *La missa paenitentium en Occident,* in the *Bulletin de littér. ecclés.,* 1902, p. 5–18.

[347] Siricius, *Epist. ad Himerium,* 7 (*P. L.,* XIII, 1137). The Pope does not speak of absolution, but only of communion, perhaps because monks and nuns are referred to. As we shall see later, Faustus of Riez looked upon the monastic profession as the equivalent of the *actio paenitentiae.*

[348] *Ibid.,* 4, col. 1136.

[349] Innocent I, *Epist. ad Exuperium,* 5, 6 (*P. L.,* XX, 498).

[350] *Liber pontificalis,* ed. Duchesne, I, p. 164; cf. p. 249.

bishop who heard the penitent's confession, determined his penance, and watched over its accomplishment, and lastly reconciled him to God and the Church by means of absolution.[351]

Clerics are not subject to penance. If they commit grave faults that are public and scandalous, they are deposed. If their faults are not public and scandalous, they can expiate them in private; but in no circumstance whatever are they ranged in the category of penitents or receive the imposition of the hand. The mere fact of a priest's having been a penitent, would have deprived him of the exercise of holy orders.[352]

On the other hand, the *actio paenitentiae* is granted but once, and has for its effect to debar a penitent, even after he is reconciled, from getting married or claiming the rights of a marriage previously contracted, or going into business, or taking up the military profession. If the penitent transgresses those prohibitions or falls back into his former sins, he is no longer admitted to the *cursus* of penance; all that he can and must do, is to weep over his relapse and expiate his sins privately. He will be allowed to assist with the faithful at the divine services; but communion will be denied to him till he is about to die, and then he will receive the viaticum, and the viaticum only.[353]

This was the state of the penitential discipline in the Latin Church about the year 430. The subsequent ages brought several important changes.

The first of these changes is the introduction, or at least

[351] *Council of Carthage* of 418, can. 3 and 4 (Mansi, III, 735); cf. *Council of Hippo* of 393, can. 34 (Mansi, III, 885, XXXII).

[352] Siricius, *Epist. ad Himer.*, 8, 11, 18; Innocent I, *Epist. ad Exuper.*, 2–4.

[353] Siricius, *Epist. ad Himer.*, 6.

the more frequent practice, of private, and the less frequent practice and gradual disappearance of public or plenary penance.

The latter involved practical difficulties which of necessity led to its gradual abandonment. The reason was not, as has long been believed, that public penance was always preceded by public accusation. In a letter written in 459, Pope St. Leo forbids, as contrary to the "apostolic rule," the public reading of the written confession of penitents, "cum reatus conscientiarum sufficiat solis sacerdotibus indicari confessione secreta. . . . Sufficit enim illa confessio quae primum Deo offertur, tum etiam sacerdoti, qui pro delictis paenitentium precator accedit."[354] The public penance began with an act of great humiliation. In the presence of the faithful, the penitent, clad in a sack or sackcloth, received the imposition of the bishop's hands and was separated, at least to some extent, from the Christian community; he had to cut his hair and wear mourning attire during the whole time of his expiation.[355] That expiation itself was severe and often long.[356] The plenary penance, in particular, entailed very inconvenient consequences. Even after he had been reconciled, the penitent could neither serve in the army nor go into business, nor get married, nor use the marriage right if he was already married.[357] Besides, penance, as has been observed, could not be renewed and left those who relapsed, in jeopardy of their

[354] *Epist.* CLXVIII, 2. However, the Pope implies that there have been abuses of that kind in some churches of Italy.

[355] St. Jerome, *Epist.* LXXIII; St. Cæsarius, *Sermo* CCLXI, 1 (*P. L.*, XXXIX); *Council of Agde* of 506, can. 15 (Mansi, VIII, 327); St. Isidore, *De eccles. offic.*, II, 17, 3–5. In Spain, on the contrary, during the 7th century, penitents let their hair and beard grow, "ut demonstrent abundantiam criminum quibus caput peccatoris gravatur."

[356] For some details, cf. St. Cæsarius, *Sermo* CCLXI, 3.

[357] Siricius, *Epist. ad Himer.*, 6; St. Leo, *Epist.* CLXVII, inquisit. 10–13.

salvation. These circumstances explain why sinners, and especially converts, disliked to submit to it and why the tendency to delay its acceptance till the last sickness became more and more widespread during the 5th and 6th centuries.

In order to obviate these grave difficulties and check the relaxation to which they gave rise, the Church authorities had recourse to mitigating measures, which in some provinces were rigorous to a degree. These measures had for their purpose to extenuate the consequences of the prevailing discipline. For instance, penance was imposed on a married person only with the consent of his partner.[358] It was not imposed upon youths whose dispositions exposed them to the danger of breaking their promises and falling back into sin.[359] Moreover, at times, a sort of dispensation from those promises was granted. In his CLXVIIth letter,[360] St. Leo examines the case of those who, after receiving penance, become defendants in a lawsuit or go into business or take up the military profession or get married. He positively objects to any one, after the *actio paenitentiae,* going back "ad militiam saecularem"; but he allows, though with reluctance, that one be a defendant in an unavoidable lawsuit, especially before an ecclesiastical court, or engage in an honest trade, if there be any trade in which sin can be avoided. As to those youths who, either when they were in danger of death or after they had been made prisoners, accepted penance, and then, once out of danger, married to avoid incontinency, the Pope sees in their action only a slight sin that had better be overlooked.[361] "In quo tamen," he adds, "non regulam constituimus, sed quid sit

[358] *Council of Arles* of 443 or 452, can. 22; *Council of Orleans* of 538, can. 24 (Mansi, IX, 18).

[359] *Council of Agde* of 506, can. 15; *of Orleans* of 538, can. 24 (Mansi, VIII, 327; IX, 18); cf. St. Cæsarius, *Sermo* CCLVI, 3.

[360] Written in the year 458 or 459; inquisitio 10–13.

[361] Cf. *Council of Toledo* of 638, can. 8 (Mansi, X, 666).

tolerabilius aestimamus." No doubt, St. Leo realized the shortcomings of the system in vogue and its inadequacy to the new conditions of Christian life; but as he was bound by venerable rules and a respect for the past, he did not venture to make a change.

Other bishops were less prudent and more severe. In the territory of Vienne and Narbonne, in order to prevent the people from postponing the request for penance till the moment of death, some rigorists refused to grant it to the dying who asked for it. Pope Celestine protested against this practice in the name of divine mercy and grace.[362] St. Leo, though he reproved the carelessness of those who delayed penance till the moment "quo vix inveniat spatium vel confessio paenitentis vel reconciliatio sacerdotis," nevertheless decided that neither the *actio paenitentiae* nor the reconciliation ought to be refused to them (*nec satisfactio interdicenda est nec reconciliatio deneganda*),[363] even when, after demanding it once and then coming back to health, they had refused it.[364] The Council of Orange, in the year 441, declared that the viaticum, and the viaticum only, ought to be granted to the dying who asked for penance, with the understanding that, if they are restored to health, they must complete their expiation (can. 3). The 20th canon of the *Statuta Ecclesiae antiqua*[365] went still farther and ruled that such penitents should be absolved before receiving the viaticum. But opposition did not cease altogether. The rigorists questioned the value of the penance taken up *in extremis,* and Faustus of Riez, among others, declared he had no confidence in an act which was an insult rather than a homage to God, and that the only salutary penance

[362] *Epist.* IV, 3. The letter was written in 428.
[363] *Epist.* CVIII, 4, 5, written in the year 452.
[364] *Epist.* CLXVII, inquis. 9.
[365] Cf. the more accurate text given in *P. L.,* LVI.

was the penance performed and properly accomplished.[366] Faustus' view gave offense. Gennadius[367] and St. Avitus of Vienne[368] attacked it; St. Cæsarius, though granting that if there were some death-bed penances that were dishonest and unprofitable, others were no doubt genuine and fruitful,[369] nevertheless insisted that by postponing penance to the last moment, sinners exposed themselves to the grave danger of having neither the time nor the means for conversion, and therefore of being lost. The fact that he returned to the subject again and again shows that his words were not generally heeded.[370] Against plenary penance, such as it was practised, people objected the difficulty of performing it, the consequences which it entailed, and also, no doubt, the impossibility of repeating it in case of relapse.[371] Whilst maintaining it for exceptionally grave crimes, could not the ecclesiastical authorities establish in addition to plenary penance an *actio pœnitentiæ* more easily performed for the more common grievous sins?

This could be done; and it seems that, after being foreshadowed and attempted here and there during the 5th and 6th centuries, such a mitigated form of discipline was definitively adopted in the 7th. Private penance retained the rite of confession, which was already secret; likewise, at least for a while, the practice of public absolution on Maundy Thursday. Private penitents were absolved together with public penitents; but the new practice differed from plenary or solemn penance in this, that the penitent, once he had

[366] *Epist.* V, p. 184 (*P. L.*, LVIII, 845); *Sermo* CCLV (*P. L.*, XXXIX, 2216), which, it seems, must be attributed to Faustus.

[367] *De eccles. dogm.*, 80. Gennadius calls Faustus' followers Novatians.

[368] *Epist.* II, edit. U. Chevalier (Sirmond, IV).

[369] *Sermo* CCLVI; CCLVII, 3, 4 (*P. L.*, XXXIX).

[370] Cf. sermons CCLVI–CCLIX (*P. L.*, XXXIX).

[371] St. Cæsarius, *Sermo* CCLVIII, 2.

made his confession, performed privately the works of satisfaction imposed upon him, and was not sequestered from the Christian community. Moreover, those who had submitted to it were not subject to the penalties of public penance, as mentioned above. Finally, as we shall see, penance became easily renewable. This, then, was the series of measures designed to remedy the inconveniences of the former discipline.

In the West, we find the first traces of the new discipline in the writings of St. Augustine, who distinguishes[372] two kinds of penitential satisfaction, an easier one for secret sins, which is performed "quibusdam correptionum medicamentis," the other *luctuosa, lamentabilior, gravior,* when the sins are very grave, publicly known and scandalous (*ita gravia*). At about the same time, Pope Innocent I, writing to Bishop Decentius of Eugubio, tells him that at Rome all penitents are absolved on Maundy Thursday, except in cases of special urgency and necessity. He divides them into two categories, those who do penance *ex gravioribus,* and those who do penance *ex levioribus commissis.*[373] Some forty years later, in 458 or 459, St. Leo, judging of the case of baptized children who, after being held captive by the heathen, had been released and now asked to receive communion, decides that those who have been guilty of idolatry, murder or fornication, must not be admitted to communion before doing public penance; whilst those who have only

[372] Cf. above, p. 375, and vol. II, p. 417–418. I say we find its first traces in St. Augustine; for it is probable that the practice is more ancient.

[373] *Epist.* XXV, 10 (*P. L.,* XX, 559): "De paenitentibus autem qui sive ex gravioribus commissis sive ex levioribus paenitentiam gerunt, si nulla interveniat aegritudo, quinta feria ante pascha eis remittendum romanae Ecclesiae consuetudo demonstrat." The letter was written in 416. In this passage, the *leviora commissa* are not what we now call *venial* sins; they are sins *non ita gravia,* in St. Augustine's sense.

eaten meats offered to idols "possunt ieiuniis et manus impositione purgari." [374] At the same time, though insisting that, according to the divine economy for the forgiveness of postbaptismal sins, forgiveness can be obtained only through sacerdotal supplications,[375] St. Leo entreats all those who are not seen in the ranks of public penitents and yet have been habitually careless in the performance of their duties,[376] to do penance once a year, especially at the approach of Easter. His intention is not to impose upon them the plenary penance: their sins — mainly of omission and spiritual sloth — probably did not call for it. Hence we may infer that what he demands of them is a private penance, in which the "supplicationes sacerdotum" form an integral part.

The same conclusion can be drawn from the sermons of St. Cæsarius of Arles. Like all ancient Patristic writers, the Saint distinguishes the *peccata minuta,* which, whilst not killing the soul, disfigure it and must be expiated by good works, from the *peccata capitalia,* which deserve hell and must be atoned for under pain of damnation.[377] What kind of penance will that be? he asks. It *may* be public; [378] but this is not necessary for salvation. St. Cæsarius makes a distinction between *accipere paenitentiam* — which means plenary penance — and *agere paenitentiam,* which signifies the private performance of penance.[379] What is required

[374] *Epist.* CLXVII, inquis. 19. Cf. Quesnel's note, col. 1503, 19.

[375] *Epist.* CVIII, 2: "Multiplex misericordia Dei ita lapsibus subvenit humanis ut non solum per baptismi gratiam, sed etiam per paenitentiae medicinam spes vitae reparetur aeternae, ut qui regenerationis dona violassent, proprio se iudicio condemnantes ad remissionem criminum pervenirent, sic divinae bonitatis praesidiis ordinatis ut indulgentia Dei nisi supplicationibus sacerdotum nequeat obtineri." This letter was written in 452.

[376] *Sermo* XLIII, 2, 3; XLIV, 1; XLIX, 1, 2; L, 1, 2.

[377] *Sermo* CIV, 1–4, 6–8.

[378] *Sermo* CIV, 7; CCLXI, 1.

[379] *Sermo* CCLVI, 1, 4; CCLIX, 1.

is that penance should be *done,* not that it should be *received:* "Qui haec [opera paenitentiae] implere voluerit, etiamsi paenitentiam non accipiat, quia semper illam fructuose et fideliter egit, bene hinc exiet." [380] "Et ille quidem qui paenitentiam publice accepit poterat eam secretius agere: sed, credo, considerans multitudinem peccatorum suorum, videt se contra tam gravia mala solum non posse sufficere, ideo adiutorium totius populi cupit expetere." [381] It would be impossible to be more explicit and declare more plainly the existence of a private penance by the side of a public or plenary penance. That distinction enables Cæsarius to answer the objections of his hearers: "Ego iuvenis homo uxorem habens, quomodo possum aut capillos minuere aut habitum religionis assumere?" [382] No one asks you to do that, the preacher replies; you can profitably do penance without all that: "Vera enim conversio sine vestimentorum commutatione sufficit sibi." [383]

Did the private penance spoken of by St. Cæsarius consist merely in works of expiation and a change of life, without recourse to the ministers of the Church either for confession or absolution? By no means; confession is obligatory. St. Cæsarius formulates its obligatory character in *Sermo* CCLIII, 1: God wills that we should confess our sins, not only to Him, but to our fellowmen; and he goes on to say: "Quomodo enim nobis peccatorum vulnera nunquam deesse possunt, sic et confessionis medicamenta deesse non debent." [384] In *Sermo* CCL, applying the phrase *Alligata per fasciculos ad comburendum,* to the sinners, whom the angels will bind together and cast into the

[380] *Sermo* CCLVI, 1.
[381] *Sermo* CCLXI, 1.
[382] This is an allusion to the monastic seclusion which was then often practiced by public penitents.
[383] *Sermo* CCXLIX, 6; cf. CCLVIII, 2.
[384] *Sermo* CCLIII, 1.

fire, "rapaces cum rapacibus, adulteros cum adulteris, fornicatores cum fornicatoribus, homicidas cum homicidis, avaros cum avaris, iracundos cum iracundis, falsos testes cum falsis testibus, fures cum furibus, derisores cum derisoribus, similes cum similibus," he exhorts the guilty to avoid this awful fate by doing penance, confessing and performing the works of satisfaction imposed by the priests: "Confessionem quaeramus puro corde, et paenitentiam donatam a sacerdotibus perficiamus"; and elsewhere: "confitendo et paenitentiam agendo."[385] It is quite probable that, in these instances, he has in view merely private penance.[386]

As to the absolution that follows private penance, it is true the Saint nowhere mentions it explicitly; no doubt, it was granted as a matter of course, since it was identified with the public absolution given on Maundy Thursday; besides, he was not exhorting his hearers on that particular point.

St. Avitus mentions an instance of absolution in his XVIth letter, in connection with a case where his teaching is manifestly the same as that of St. Cæsarius. An old man of the diocese of Grenoble is leading an incestuous life and does not seem to be disposed to do penance. Bishop Victorius asks St. Avitus what he thinks of that difficult case. After seeing the culprit, St. Avitus answers that, since the old sinner promises to dismiss his accomplice, it is prudent not to impose on him the plenary penance: "De caetero quod ad paenitentiam exspectat, moneatur interim agere, accipere non cogatur." He is rather peevish (*homo crudus*), and excessive severity would make him still more obstinate; his renouncing the occasion of sin will serve as a penance, and after he has made that sacrifice, he can be

[385] *Sermo* CCL, 1, 2; CCLVIII, 1.

[386] As a matter of fact, when speaking of public penance, St. Cæsarius declares expressly that such is his meaning.

reconciled: "Excussus ab scelere, suscipiatur ad veniam; patiatur paenitentiam cum perdit peccandi occasionem; profiteatur, cum amiserit voluntatem." [387]

It is certain, then, that, at the latest, at the time of St. Cæsarius and St. Avitus, *i.e.*, in the first half of the 6th century, private penance was practiced in Southern Gaul and probably in Italy. Two facts contributed to spread and strengthen the practice.

The first is the foundation of the Benedictine order and the drawing up of its rule (about 480–543). The influence of that rule was certainly felt outside the monasteries for which it was composed. Now, it demanded of the monks frequent accusations and confessions. Public sins were publicly atoned for: "si animae vero peccati," the rule continues, "causa latens fuerit, tantum abbati aut spiritualibus senioribus patefaciat, qui sciant curare sua et aliena vulnera non detegere et publicare." [388]

[387] Gennadius observes that public penance, when it was obligatory, could be to some extent commuted into private penance, through one's entering a monastery; and it does not seem that absolution was then given; the forgiveness of sins was obtained through the monastic life of expiation: "Sed et secreta satisfactione solvi mortalia crimina non negamus, sed mutato prius saeculari habitu, et confesso religionis studio per vitae correctionem et iugi, immo perpetuo luctu miserante Deo" (*De eccles. dogm.*, 53). Cf. Faustus, *Sermo* III (*P. L.*, LVIII, 875): "Detur paenitentia saeculari, cuius adhuc cervix sub iugo dependet saeculi. . . . Caeterum, si abrenuntians saeculo et eius militiae, et spondens se cunctis diebus serviturum Deo, cur paenitentiam mereatur? . . . Igitur abrenuntianti publica paenitentia non est necessaria, quia conversus ingemuit, et cum Deo aeternum pactum inivit. Ex illo igitur die non memorantur eius delicta quae gessit in saeculo. . . . Ergo post chirographum de quo se monachus debitum ex tota fide promiserit adimplere, etsi fidelis factus peccaverit in saeculo, post abrenuntiationem iterum factam, dominicum corpus non dubitet accipere." Monastic profession was looked upon as a second baptism.

[388] *Regula*, XVI (*P. L.*, LXVI, 694). The *spirituales seniores* here mentioned are apparently the same as the πατέρες πνευματικοί of the Greeks, *i. e.*, the monks who were confessors.

The other fact, which was more directly influential, was the importation, by St. Columbanus, into France and Italy of the British customs concerning private penance.[389] At the northwestern extremity of Western Christendom, in Ireland and England, there lived several Christian communities which seem to have been unacquainted with the practice of public penance or at least to have rejected it at an early date and practiced private penance only. There, about the end of the 5th or at the beginning of the 6th century, a literature begins to be formed, the literature of the *penitentials,* the remnants of which bear the venerated names of St. David (+ 564), St. Vennianus (+ 552), St. Gildas (+ 565 or 570) and later on of Cummeanus (+ 661). They determine for each kind of sin the expiation that is to be imposed on the penitent.[390] The use of these little booklets, which was first confined to the Celtic and British churches, gradually spread, during the 7th century and after the Anglo-Saxon conquest, in the churches established among the conquerors by St. Augustine of Canterbury and his successors. Theodore of Canterbury (+ 690) also wrote a penitential; likewise Bede and his disciple Egbert of York (bishop from 735 till 766).[391] Theodore's penitential expressly declares that "Reconciliatio ideo in hac provincia publice statuta non est, quia et publica paenitentia non est."[392] It was precisely this British practice of an exclusively private penance which St. Columbanus brought

[389] On what follows, cf. Dom L. Gougaud, *Les chrétientés celtiques,* Paris, 1911, p. 274 and foll.

[390] See these various writings in the editions of Wasserschleben and Schmitz, *opp. cit.* We have them no longer in their original form; we find them mixed up and combined with other elements in penitentials of a later date, where they can still be recognized to some extent.

[391] See these documents in Wasserschleben and Schmitz.

[392] Schmitz, *Die Bussbücher,* II, p. 580.

over to the continent, to Luxeuil about 590, to Bobbio about 613.[393] Notwithstanding the fact that St. Columbanus and his practices were at first generally opposed, private penance and the use of penitentials were the more readily accepted as they were not without precedent and came to satisfy real needs. Moreover, the disciples of St. Columbanus did not remain within the walls of their monasteries; as they became bishops, abbots, missionaries and pastors of souls, many of them introduced the customs of their order in the exercise of their functions and duties. Thus it happened that private penance, which first appeared in France and Italy in the 5th century, was definitely organized during the 7th century and became the ordinary and normal practice, public penance being reserved for exceptionally scandalous and revolting sins. During the 8th century, penitentials were current everywhere.[394]

The adoption of private penance naturally led people to look upon the reiteration of penance as possible, since the principle of the oneness of penance — a principle that had been so strongly upheld — referred only to its solemn form. Those penitents of whom Pope Innocent I tells us that they atoned for their *commissa leviora* during Lent, must have repeated that penance at least now and then, if not every

[393] We still have a penitential under the name of St. Columbanus; but its authenticity is not established. One of its regulations is as follows: "Confessiones autem dari diligentius praecipitur, maxime de commotionibus animi, antequam ad missam eatur, ne forte quis accedat indignus ad altare, id est, si cor mundum non habuerit" (30; Schmitz, *Die Bussbücher*, I, p. 601). The Xth chapter of the rule of St. Columbanus reads as follows: "Diversitas culparum diversitatis paenitentiae medicamento sanari debet. Itaque, fratres, huiusmodi statutum est a sanctis Patribus ut demus confessionem de omnibus non solum capitalibus criminibus, sed etiam de maioribus negligentiis: quia confessio et paenitentia de morte liberant" (*P. L.*, LXXX, 216).

[394] Except, of course, in Africa and Spain. The oldest German, French and Italian penitentials that we have, date, in their present form, from the end of the 8th century.

year. But, besides, there has come down to us from that period a very significant and precise doctrinal detail. I have in view the words of an African bishop of the middle of the 5th century, Victor of Cartenna. In his treatise *De paenitentia,*[395] the author first insists on the important law of the confession of sins: "Age igitur, paenitens, propria scelera confitere, pande Deo tuae iniquitatis arcana, denuda secreta pectoris tui" (1). Confession must be made, not because God does not know the sins that are confessed to Him, but because confession, by revealing the penitent to himself, acts as a remedy, and also because the physician requires that the evil be made known to him so that he can apply the proper remedy: "Tunc enim poteris perfectum consequi beneficium medicinae si non celes medico tuae vulnera conscientiae. Caeterum qualiter curandus eris qui ea quae sunt in te absconsa non pandis?" (3). Bishop Victor then answers successively the various excuses devised and suggested by the culprit. The latter alleges, among other things, that he has had a relapse, and that, after being absolved from his sins, he has fallen back, nay, has sunk, as it were, into them: "Peccata peccatis adieci, et qui iam cadens erectus fueram, iterum cecidi, et conscientiae meae vulnus iam pene curatum peccati exulceratione recrudui." Victor answers that one must have recourse to the same physician and to the same remedy: "Quid trepidas? Quid vereris? Idem semper est, qui ante curavit, medicum non mutabis . . . noto te sanabit antidoto. . . . Unde dudum curatus fueras, inde iterum curaberis" (12, and cf. 24).

The rule of conduct laid down here by the Bishop of Cartenna probably found much favor in Spain, for in the year 589 a council of Toledo complains that some Christians

[395] Edited among the works of St. Ambrose, *P. L.*, XVII, 791 and foll.

do very imperfect penance for their sins, "ut quotienscumque peccare libuerit, totiens a presbytero reconciliari expostulent." [396] The council condemns this practice, but it outlived all enactments made against it. The influence of the monasteries and the use of penitentials soon contributed to make the reiteration of private penance a current practice. In the middle of the 8th century, the law obliging the faithful to confess once, or several times a year, begins to appear. A council of Bavaria, held about 740–750, merely suggests confession; [397] but St. Chrodegang, bishop of Metz (742–764), obliged his clergy to confess at least twice a year: "Constituimus ut in anno vel binas vices clerus noster confessiones suas ad suum episcopum pure faciat, eis temporibus, una vice in initio quadragesimae ante Pascha, illa alia vice a medio mense augusto usque kalend. novembris." [398]

The text says that clerics must confess *to the bishop;* a few lines further on, St. Chrodegang adds that, if clerics feel the need of it, they may confess "ad episcopum, vel ad alium sacerdotem cui episcopus decreverit." In this last passage the *sacerdos* is no longer the bishop but an ordinary priest. The attribution of the power of hearing confessions and absolving penitents, to priests as ordinary ministers, is one of the changes that were introduced into the penitential discipline during the period we are now studying. That power had never been altogether denied to them. As we have seen, at Rome, as early as the 4th century, there were *paenitentiarii,* priests who heard the sinners' confessions and imposed on them the penance to perform; and

[396] Mansi, IX, 995.

[397] Mansi, XIII, 1027.

[398] *Regula canonicorum,* XIV (*P. L.,* LXXXIX, 1104). The longer recension, published in the same volume, col. 1057 and fol., which contains (col. 1071–1073) a more complete series of ordinances, has been altered.

even those councils that forbade priests to reconcile penitents, publicly acknowledged their right, and imposed upon them the duty, of absolving them with the bishop's consent and in case of urgent necessity, if the bishop were absent.[399] Quite naturally, as penance became more frequent and less solemn, ordinary priests administered it more often. This was made the subject of the complaints already referred to at the Council of Toledo, in 589. Penance has come to be as often repeated as one falls, and it is to a priest (*presbytero*) that one applies for reconciliation. But all these protests could not stem a development that was, on the whole, legitimate. As the bishop was no longer equal to the task of hearing confessions and absolving penitents, priests must be delegated to replace him. The revolution that resulted from the new order of things was perfected during the 7th century, when the monks of St. Columbanus in France applied themselves to the ministry of confession. In the first third of the 8th century, the venerable Bede makes no difference between bishops and priests, from the viewpoint with which we are concerned: "Etiam nunc in episcopis ac presbyteris omni Ecclesiae officium idem ita committitur, ut videlicet, agnitis peccantium causis, quoscumque humiles ac vere paenitentes aspexerit, hos iam a timore perpetuae mortis miserans absolvat: quos vero in peccatis quae egerint persistere cognoverit, illos perennibus suppliciis obligandos insinuet." [400]

The introduction of priests as ordinary ministers of penance must have contributed to the rapid spread of the so-called penitentials throughout France, Germany, and Upper

[399] "Ut presbyter inconsulto episcopo non reconciliet paenitentes nisi absentia episcopi et necessitate cogente." *Council of Hippo* of 393, canon 30; *Carthage*, of 387 or 390, canon 3 and 4; *Seville*, of 619, can. 7; *Agde*, of 506, can. 44 (Mansi, III, 885, XXXII; III, 693; X, 559; VIII, 332).

[400] *Homil.* II, 16, col. 223.

Italy. The form of penance, with its definite scale of punishments as given in those penitentials, certainly marked a retrogression. Till then, the great principle that is inculcated again and again by Popes and Councils, is that, whilst the satisfaction to be imposed on the culprit must be in proportion to the nature of the faults he has committed, it must also be in proportion to his disposition, condition, and age; the confessor remains the judge of what he must require, and the penitential canons have no other value than that of suggestions.[401] There are no abstract sins, there are only sinners who must be judged and raised up from sin: "Tempora paenitudinis, habita moderatione tuo constituente iudicio," writes St. Leo, "prout conversorum animos perspexeris esse devotos: pariter etiam habens senilis aetatis intuitum, et periculorum quorumque aut aegritudinis respiciens necessitates." [402] In the penitentials the viewpoint is changed. They do not altogether ignore the recommendations of old. The penitential of Bede, for instance, begins by reminding the confessor that he must heed the penitent's sex, age, condition, state and inner disposition, and attune his judgment thereto;[403] nevertheless, the various kinds of sins are distributed into categories, and to each of these categories there is assigned a definite penance: "*Adulescens, si cum virgine peccaverit, annum I paeniteat.*" Now, it goes without saying that this simple way of imposing penance may be suitable to confessors of mediocre learning, who are neither particularly anxious nor capable of making a concrete study of human souls, as was the case with many priests in the period from the 6th to the 8th

[401] Innocent I, *Epist. ad Decentium*, 10; St. Leo, *Epist.* X. 8; CLIX, 5, 6; St. Gregory, *In evang. homil.* XXVI, 6; *Counc. of Hippo* of 393, can. 30; of *Angers* of 453, can. 12 (Mansi, III, 585; XXXI; VII, 902).

[402] *Epist.* CLIX, 6.

[403] Schmitz, *Die Bussbücher*, I, p. 556.

century. Those churchmen found in the penitentials ready-made recipes for every kind of moral sickness, and definite computations for every sin committed; because of their mediocrity, they could not but appreciate such an easy help.

However, it does not seem that the use of penitentials did away everywhere with the custom requiring that, as a rule and excepting cases of urgent necessity, the penance should be performed before the absolution was granted. That urgent necessity occurred especially when the culprit applied for penance in his last sickness; and this is why St. Leo urged sinners not to wait before making their peace with God, for the time "quo vix inveniat spatium vel confessio paenitentis vel reconciliatio sacerdotis." [404] But if the sick man recovered his health, he was placed among the penitents.[405] However, the unstable conditions of life and the many dangers to which the barbarian invasions and the unceasing quarrels of princes gave rise, necessarily made the cases where the penitent had to be immediately absolved more and more numerous; [406] and it is this state of things which the XXXIst statute of St. Boniface of Mayence (+ 755) has in view: "Et quia varia necessitate praepedimur canonum statuta de conciliandis paenitentibus pleniter observare; propterea omnino non dimittantur. Curet unusquisque presbyter statim post acceptam confessionem paenitentium singulos data oratione reconciliari. Morientibus vero sine cunctamine communio et reconciliatio praebeatur." [407] The canonical prescriptions are to be com-

[404] *Epist.* CVIII, 5; *Statuta Ecclesiae antiq.*, 20; *Council of Toledo*, of 675, can. 12 (MANSI, XI, 144).

[405] *Council of Orange* of 441, can. 3; of *Epaon* of 517, can. 36 (MANSI, VI, 436; VIII, 563); *Statuta Eccl. ant.*, 21.

[406] Judging from the penitential that is called after St. Columbanus, the immediate absolution of the penitent was customary in England and Ireland (SCHMITZ, *Die Bussbücher*, I, 601).

[407] *P. L.*, LXXXIX, 823.

plied with as closely as possible; but in case of necessity, penitents must be immediately and readily reconciled.

Absolution is still granted by means of a deprecatory formula: "*supplicationibus sacerdotum . . . sacerdotali supplicatione,*" says St. Leo.[408] According to St. Gregory, who follows in the footsteps of St. Augustine, it strikes the bonds of sin from those whom divine grace has already restored to spiritual life. Through confession the penitent comes out of the grave: "Prius mortuum Dominus vocavit et vivificavit dicens, *Lazare, venis foras*"; the absolution breaks his bands asunder: "Et postmodum is qui vivens egressus fuerat a discipulis est solutus. . . . Ecce illum discipuli iam viventem solvunt quem magister resuscitaverat mortuum." The author concludes as follows: "Ex qua consideratione intuendum est quod illos nos debemus per pastoralem auctoritatem solvere quos auctorem nostrum cognoscimus per suscitantem gratiam vivificare." As can be readily seen, St. Gregory describes, as though they were successive, two effects which are, as a matter of fact, simultaneous, and both of which proceed directly from the absolution. But, even with that, he does not look upon the latter as merely declaratory. The sinner's deliverance and reconciliation are truly the work of the "pastoralis auctoritas"; he is absolved by the "pastoralis sententia." Nay, as the Pope observes, even when the penitent is unjustly bound by his confessor, he remains bound; and whilst confessors must beware lest they give wrong decisions, the faithful also must fear lest, through their sins, they deserve to become the object of false decisions.[409]

[408] *Epist.* CVIII, 2, 3. See the order of the ceremony of Maunday Thursday and the formulas in L. DUCHESNE, *Origines du culte chrétien*, p. 424 (English transl., p. 439).

[409] *In evangel. homil.* XXVI, 6; *Moral.*, XXII, 31; ST. PETER CHRYSOL., *Sermo* LXXXIV, col. 438; ST. FULGENTIUS, *De remiss. peccat.*, I, 24; *De fide*, 37.

As to the clergy, the changes in the penitential discipline during the epoch which we are now studying may be summed up in these two propositions: (1) Some, who have gone through the penitential exercises, are admitted into the ranks of the clergy; (2) all clerics, including those in higher orders, are admitted to penance.

In regard to the first point, the discipline of the 4th century was very firm: no one who had received the canonical penance could join the clergy.[410] But the rule seems to have been mitigated, first as regards the lower orders,[411] and then, during the 6th century, even as regards the higher orders, judging from the protests to which these infractions give rise: "Ex paenitentibus quamvis bonus clericus non ordinetur," we read in the *Statuta antiqua.*[412] The reasons for this mitigation are easily understood. They are: the difficulty of finding suitable candidates for the clergy, and, chiefly, the custom of asking penance in danger of death, a custom that tended to become more and more prevalent. St. Cæsarius implies in his sermons that this was a very common occurrence,[413] and St. Isidore, writing less than a century later, declares that, as all men are sinners, penance is obligatory for all and all must submit to it.[414] But now and then it happened that these eleventh-hour penitents did *not* die. They were regular, nay, pious Christians, who had asked to receive penance as a remedy for their daily

[410] Siricius, *Epist. ad Himerium,* 18, 19; *Council of Rome* of November 465, can. 3 (Mansi, VII, 961).

[411] A council of Toledo in the year 400 says that, in case of necessity or if sanctioned by custom, *ostiarii* and lectors may be taken from the ranks of the penitents, canon 2 (Mansi, III, 998).

[412] *Statuta,* 84; *Council of Agde,* can. 43 (Mansi, VIII, 332).

[413] St. Cæsarius was anxious that no one should die before receiving the remedy of penance: "cum nullus sine medicamento paenitentiae de hoc mundo vir Dei voluisset recedere" (*S. Caesarii vita,* II, 9; *P. L.,* LXVII, 1029).

[414] *De eccles. offic.,* I, 17, 6.

faults and a thing without which one must not appear before God, although they might easily have done without it. If they wished to join the clergy, should they be prevented from so doing? A council of Gerunda in the year 517 decreed that, if the sick man had accused himself of no public sin and if, after recovering his health, he had not been compelled to do public penance, he could be received into the ranks of the clergy.[415] This decision was confirmed by the Council of Toledo in 633,[416] and by another council held in the same city in 683.[417] Meanwhile a council of Lerida, in the year 524, had enacted that a cleric who served at the altar and had done penance for a sin of unchastity, could be restored to his functions, although he could not receive higher orders.[418]

Hence, after the 6th century, at least in Spain, the fact of having *received* penance — provided one had not confessed a fault deserving plenary penance nor effectively undergone that penance — ceased to be an impediment excluding a man from the priesthood. Through a similar and parallel evolution it also came to pass, gradually, that clerics in higher orders could do penance without forfeiting their functions. There exists, on this subject, a rather difficult canon of the Council of Orange, of the year 441. It says: "Paenitentiam desiderantibus clericis non negandam."[419] This may refer merely to a strictly private penance, performed without any intervention of the episcopal authority, and for which a cleric demands a temporary exemption from his service at the altar.[420] However, at

[415] Can. 9, MANSI, VIII, 550.
[416] Canon 54, MANSI, X, 632.
[417] MANSI, XI, 1071.
[418] Canon 5, MANSI, VIII, 613.
[419] Canon 4, MANSI, VI, 437.
[420] This is the explanation of Dom Leclercq (*Hist. des conc.*, II, 1, p. 438). I rather believe that the canonical penance is referred to,

that time the discipline was explicit: no priest or deacon guilty of a grievous or scandalous fault could be subjected to the canonical penance, as long as he continued to exercise his functions. He must first be deposed; and even after being deposed, the Council of Carthage of the year 401 rules that, unlike laymen, he can not be subjected to public penance.[421] That is St. Leo's answer to Rusticus of Narbonne: "Alienum est a consuetudine ecclesiastica ut qui in presbyterali honore aut in diaconii gradu fuerint consecrati, ii pro crimine aliquo suo per manus impositionem remedium accipiant paenitentiae. . . . Unde huiusmodi lapsis ad promerendam misericordiam Dei privata est expetenda secessio, ubi illis satisfactio, si fuerit digna, sit etiam fructuosa." [422] Priests and deacons (and bishops), who may be guilty of grievous sins, whether public or secret, must do penance by themselves, but must not be reckoned among public penitents.[423] The Pope speaks rather vaguely of a *privata secessio;* we know that, as a matter of fact, this consisted in a more or less prolonged confinement in a monastery.[424] It is partly because of that custom that the

and that this is the decision which determined Rusticus of Narbonne to address to Pope St. Leo the request of which we are about to speak. By the word "canonical penance," I mean the official penance, whether it was private or public, in opposition to the absolutely private penance performed without the intervention of the clergy, and without confession and absolution.

[421] Cf. supra, p. 377, and the 12th canon of the Council of Carthage of 401 (Mansi, III, 726, XXVII).

[422] *Epist.* CLXVII, inquis. 2.

[423] I see no reason for restricting St. Leo's decision to the case of secret sins; the Pope says, "pro crimine aliquo," in general. The rule that he lays down is identical with that noted by St. Isidore: all must do penance, but "a sacerdotibus et levitis, Deo tantum teste . . . a caeteris vero attestante coram Deo solemniter sacerdote" (*De eccles. offic.*, II, 17, 6).

[424] *Council of Epaon* of 517, can. 22 (Mansi, VIII, 561); St. Gregory, *Epist.* IX, 63; XII, 31.

practice of canonical penance was introduced among the clergy. For, like the monks with whom they lived, guilty clerics were subjected, during the 7th century, to the imposition of the hand and sacramental reconciliation: in a word, they "received penance." On the other hand, the clergy did not remain altogether unaffected by that tendency which prompted the faithful, when in danger of death, to ask for penance; a practice which gave rise, at times, to rather perplexing difficulties. The Council of Toledo (683) had to settle a case of that kind, in connection with Gaudentius, bishop of Valeria, "quod incommodae valetudinis nimietate praeventus, per manus impositionem subactus fuisset paenitentiae legibus." Gaudentius, who had recovered from his illness, wanted to know if he could continue to exercise his episcopal functions. The decision of the Council was that he could, since he had accused himself of no grave and scandalous fault.[425] Thus, during the 7th century, the discipline that deprived higher clerics of the benefit of the canonical penance was falling into desuetude. During the 8th century, as we have seen, St. Chrodegang decreed that all the members of his clergy should go to confession at least twice a year;[426] and the penitential books of that time contain lists of the various faults that may be committed by clerics of various orders as well as by the laity.

This, then, was the historical conclusion of the dogmatic and disciplinary development of penance about the middle of the 8th century.

The *actio paenitentiae* comprises three parts: confession, expiation, absolution.

Confession is made secretly; it has for its object the

[425] Mansi, XI, 1071.
[426] Cf. above, p. 390.

peccata capitalia, i.e., all those sins that deserve hell and that we now call *mortal.*[427]

Expiation is public and plenary for a few exceptionally grave and scandalous crimes; but usually it is private. Private penance gradually takes the place of public penance and is almost exclusively used. Besides, through the use of penitentials, it becomes regulated, each category of faults having its penance fixed beforehand.

The absolution, which at first used to be given publicly on Maundy Thursday, except in case of sickness, is now given privately and at any time of the year. In principle, it is given only after the penitential satisfaction has been accomplished; but, as a matter of fact, there are already some exceptions to this rule, and the number of exceptions is on the increase.

Whilst plenary and solemn penance is not repeated, pri-

[427] This is the meaning given by St. Cæsarius to the expression *peccata mortalia.* After quoting instances of that kind of sins, he goes on to make the following enumeration: "sacrilegium, homicidium, adulterium, falsum testimonium, furtum, rapina, superbia, invidia, avaritia et, si longo teneatur, iracundia, et ebrietas si assidua sit in eorum numero computatur" (*Sermo* CIV, 2; cf. XIII, 5; LXVIII, 3). The reader may notice that *apostasy* and *idolatry* have been replaced by *sacrilege,* which has become more general. Moreover, there is a tendency to regard the three former sins *ad mortem* as the three types of sins against God, one's neighbor and oneself. Distinguishing the *peccata levia,* that are committed by the just, from the *peccata gravia,* that are committed by the wicked (*iniqui*), St. Fulgentius observes that the latter commit those sins in three ways: "aut enim sacrilegiis, aut flagitiis, aut facinoribus implicantur." Apostasy and heresy are included among the *sacrilegia;* the *flagitia* are the sins against oneself (*in seipsis immoderati atque obsceni turpiter vivunt*); and lastly, by *facinora* we must understand the injury caused to the neighbor: "quando alios aut damnis aut quibuslibet oppressionibus crudeliter laedunt" (*De incarnatione,* 36, 37). St. Gregory enumerates seven capital sins that spring from pride as their common source: "inanis gloria, invidia, ira, tristitia, avaritia, ventris ingluvies, luxuria" (*Moral.,* XXXI, 87; cf. St. Isidore, *Different.,* II, 161–168).

vate penance can be repeated. Simple priests become the ministers of the latter form of penance; they hear confession, determine the satisfaction to be rendered, and absolve the penitent.

Lastly, the fact of having submitted to penance — provided one has neither confessed any scandalous crime nor performed public penance — is no obstacle to one's joining the clergy or receiving higher orders. *Vice versa,* all clerics, even those who belong to the higher orders, are admitted to canonical penance; and they retain their functions, unless the faults they have committed call for public penance and deposition.

§ 11. Extreme Unction. Holy Orders. Matrimony.

Extreme unction, which, as we have seen, is mentioned by Pope Innocent I in his letter to Decentius, at the beginning of the 5th century, is more and more frequently referred to, in proportion as one advances into the Middle Ages, and in almost every case is accompanied by an explicit allusion to the text of St. James V, 14, 15. "Quoties aliqua infirmitas supervenerit," writes St. Cæsarius,[428] "corpus et sanguinem Christi ille qui aegrotat accipiat: et inde corpusculum suum ungat; ut illud quod scriptum est impleatur in eo, *Infirmatur aliquis, inducat presbyteros, et orent super eum ungentes eum oleo; et oratio fidei salvabit infirmum, et alleviabit eum Dominus; et si in peccatis sit, dimittentur ei.*" Similar texts are found in Cassiodorus,[429] Sonnatius of Rheims (600–631),[430] St. Eligius of Noyon

[428] *Sermo* CCLXV, 3 (*P. L.*, XXXIX, 2238).
[429] *Complexio in epist. sancti Iacobi,* II (*P. L.*, LXX, 1380).
[430] *Statuta,* 15 (*P. L.*, LXXX, 445).

(640–659),[431] the Venerable Bede,[432] Egbert of York,[433] and St. Boniface of Mayence.[434] St. Bede speaks of that ceremony as a current custom of the Church in his time: "nunc Ecclesiae consuetudo tenet"; and, following Innocent I, to whom he refers, remarks that the faithful can anoint themselves with the oil of the sick, although that oil must of necessity be consecrated by a bishop. In the statute mentioned above, St. Boniface enjoins all his priests to have in their possession some of that oil, and to warn the faithful that they must have recourse to the priestly ministry in time of sickness.

St. Leo calls the priesthood *sacramentum,*[435] but he does not explain the meaning which he assigns to this word. In the 5th and 6th centuries, the number of orders has been long determined in the Latin Church, although there does not seem to be a perfect agreement as to the respective dignity of the various minor orders. The *Statuta Ecclesiae antiqua* (90–98) give the hierarchy just as it is to-day, *episcopus, presbyter, diaconus, subdiaconus, acolythus, exorcista, lector, ostiarius* [*psalmista id est cantor*]. It is given thus also by St. Isidore in his *Etymologies,*[436] except that he places the cantor ahead of the porter; but, in his *De ecclesiasticis officiis* he follows this order: bishop, priest, deacon, subdeacon, lector, psalmist, exorcist, acolyte, and porter.[437] Moreover, like the *Statuta,* he observes that,

[431] *De rectitudine catholicae conversationis* (*P. L.,* XL, 1172).
[432] *In Iacobi epistulam* (*P. L.,* XCIII, 39).
[433] *Paenitentialis libri I pars altera,* 15 (*P. L.,* LXXXIX, 416). Cf. also the modified rule of St. Chrodegang, LXXI (*P. L.,* LXXXIX, 1088).
[434] *Statuta,* XXIX (*P. L.,* LXXXIX, 823).
[435] *Epist.* XII, 3.
[436] VII, 12, 3.
[437] II, 5–15.

properly speaking, cantors and psalmists were not ordained, but could be delegated to their office by an ordinary priest.

In the *Statuta* just mentioned, are found the ceremonies prescribed for the conferring of orders, and the formulas to be recited for the last three. This is the Gallican *ordo* which, with the Roman *ordo,* was combined into our present *Pontificale.*[438]

The documents of that epoch, particularly papal letters and conciliar decrees, contain many disciplinary decisions regarding the various degrees of the hierarchy, and especially its higher degrees, but they fall outside our province. We will merely observe that continency, which had been imposed on bishops, priests and deacons as early as the 4th century, does not seem to have been obligatory for subdeacons before the 5th century. St. Leo's letter to Anastasius of Thessalonica [439] contains, perhaps, the first attestation of that discipline,— a Roman discipline which was not immediately applied everywhere.[440]

At the time of which we are speaking, the most important problem in connection with ordinations was that of reiteration. What of ordinations conferred by heretics and schismatics, or performed contrary to the canons? The answer of the Augustinian theology to this question is plain. These ordinations though unlawful, are valid, and if the *ordinatus* is to be allowed to continue his functions, he must not be reordained. This is the sense of St. Leo's reply to the bishops of Mauretania Caesareensis, in the year 446.[441] Pope Pelagius also writes in this sense, in connection with the consecration of Paulinus of Aquileia, by Vitalis, schis-

[438] Cf. L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien,* p. 339 and foll. (English transl., p. 350 and foll.).

[439] *Epist.* XIV, 4. Jaffé assigns it, though with some hesitation, to the year 446.

[440] Cf. St. Gregory, *Epist.* I, 44 (col. 505, 506).

[441] *Epist.* XII, 6.

matic bishop of Milan, in the year 557, and in connection with the flight of another Paulinus, schismatic bishop of Fossumbrosa, in Tuscia.[442] Even granting that some of Pelagius' expressions are inaccurate,[443] his meaning is unmistakable. Subsequently prejudice, ignorance, and passion combined to obscure a doctrine which had been cleared up by the genius of St. Augustine. As we have seen, the Greeks were rather inclined to reject the ordinations of heretics. In the conflict which prevailed between the Anglo-Saxon and the British churches during the 6th and 7th centuries, the Cilician monk Theodore, who had become archbishop of Canterbury, unhesitatingly applied the principles he had imbibed in his youth, as a weapon against the Quartodeciman heretics, *i.e.*, the British clergy.[444] Ceadda, a Northumbrian by birth, had been consecrated bishop of York by the bishop of Winchester, assisted by two British bishops; Theodore deposed him, and regarding all the ordinations he had received as null, had all of them repeated before allowing him to be made bishop of Lichfield.[445] In his penitential he inserted the (26th) prescription: "Si quis ab hereticis ordinatus sit, iterum debet ordinari." [446] A

[442] *P. L.*, LXIX, 411, 412. Regarding these facts, cf. L. Saltet, *Les réordinations*, p. 79–81.

[443] "Pudenda, ut ita dicam, rapina in divisione non est consecratus sed execratus episcopus. Si enim ipsum nomen consecrationis rationabili ac vivaci intellectu discutimus, is qui cum universali detrectat consecrari Ecclesia, consecratus dici vel esse nulla ratione poterit" (col. 411). Elsewhere: "Non est Christi corpus quod schismaticus conficit, si veritate duce dirigimur" (col. 412).

[444] One of the special customs of the British churches was to celebrate the feast of Easter according to an old Roman *computus* of the year 343, which had been given up at Rome, but had nothing to do with the former Quartodeciman *computus;* however, those who followed it, were called Quartodeciman heretics.

[445] *Eddii Stephani vita Wilfridi episcopi*, XV, ap. Saltet, *op. cit.*, p. 89; Bede, *Hist. eccles.*, III, 28; IV, 2, 3.

[446] Schmitz, *Die Bussbücher*, II, p. 524; cf. 541; I, p. 528.

far more important deviation was made by the Roman council of the year 769, which pronounced the nullity of all the ordinations that had been performed by Pope Constantine, — a usurper, indeed, but a true bishop, nevertheless — and obliged those whom he had ordained, to be reordained, in case they were chosen for the functions to which they had been promoted by Constantine.[447] These facts and the exaggerated expressions of Pelagius — already quoted — caused uncertainty on the subject of the validity of ordinations conferred by heretics and schismatics. This uncertainty increased in the following ages and it took many a day to conquer and dispel it.

As we have seen above,[448] St. Augustine gave the name *sacramentum* to Christian marriage, considered as a figure of the union of Christ with His Church, and because of its indissolubility. We have also observed that the same expression, borrowed from St. Paul, is used by Salvian: *connubii sacramenta, venerabilis connubii sacramenta,*[449] and is explained by St. Isidore as follows: "Sacramentum autem ideo inter coniugatos dictum est, quia sicut non potest Ecclesia dividi a Christo, ita et uxor a viro. Quod ergo in Christo et in Ecclesia hoc in singulis quibusque viris atque uxoribus cuniunctionis inseparabile sacramentum est." [450]

It is, then, from the symbolism of marriage that St. Isidore, following the lead of St. Augustine, infers its indissolubility. That indissolubility, as a general rule, is proclaimed by Innocent I in his answer to St. Exuperius of

[447] See the facts and the texts in L. Saltet, *op. cit.*, p. 101 and foll. The council was made up of some forty Italian and thirteen French bishops.

[448] Vol. II, p. 424.

[449] *De gubernatione Dei,* IV, 5; VII, 3.

[450] *De eccles. offic.,* II, 20, 11.

Toulouse,[451] by St. Leo in his answer to Nicetas of Aquileia,[452] and by St. Gregory.[453] Excepting the case of adultery, husband and wife are absolutely forbidden to separate. But in case of adultery, can the innocent party repudiate the culprit and remarry, and is the culprit also free to remarry? On this subject, we naturally expect to find in the theology of Theodore of Canterbury traces of his Greek training, as we did on the subject of ordinations. These traces *are* found. Among the *Dicta Theodori* we read: 66, "Si cuius uxor fornicata fuit, licet dimittere eam et aliam accipere"; 67, "Mulieri non est licitum virum suum dimittere licet fornicator, nisi forte pro monasterio. Basilius iudicavit"; 70, "Si mulier discesserit a viro suo dispiciens eum, et nolens ad eum revertere et reconciliare cum illo viro suo, post v annos cum sensu episcopi aliam accipere licebit." And again, 82, "Si vir dimiserit uxorem propter fornicationem, si prima fuerit, licitum est ut aliam accipiat uxorem; illa vero, si voluerit penitere peccata sua, post quinque annos alium virum accipiat."[454]

However, even in England, these decisions dictated or inspired by the Archbishop of Canterbury do not seem to have met with universal acceptance. St. Bede[455] mentions a council of Hertford, held in the year 673, of which the tenth canon reads: "Nullus coniugem propriam, nisi, ut sanctum evangelium docet, fornicationis causa, relinquat.

[451] *Epist.* VI, 12 (col. 500).

[452] *Epist.* CLIX, 1–4.

[453] *Epist.* XI, 45 (col. 1161), 50.

[454] Schmitz, *Die Bussbücher*, II, p. 529–531. On p. 530, n. 72, there is a still more liberal decision, which allows the husband whose wife has become a captive and who cannot redeem her, to take another wife; and the first wife, when set free, to take another husband.

[455] The reader may notice that Bede interprets the phrase, *Excepta fornicationis causa* of "omnis concupiscentia vel avaritia vel idololatria quae hominem faciunt a lege Dei aberrare" (*In Matth.*, cap. V, col. 28).

Quod si quisquam propriam expulerit coniugem legitimo sibi matrimonio cuniunctam, si christianus esse recte voluerit, nulli alteri copuletur; sed ita permaneat, aut propriae reconcilietur coniugi." [456] Still less were these decisions accepted by the continental churches. At Rome, the doctrine was already settled.[457] In Africa, a council of Carthage in 407 had sanctioned the Augustinian view.[458] In Spain, it was asserted by St. Isidore,[459] following in the steps of the council of Elvira (about the year 305), which had already forbidden the wife whose husband was an adulterer, to remarry. In Gaul, the council of Arles (314) had declared that young husbands, who had separated from their wives, on account of adultery on the part of the latter, must be exhorted not to remarry.[460] The severity of these decisions became still greater under St. Cæsarius. In Northern France, however, the teaching on this subject was far less definite, no doubt because it was influenced by previous customs. Whilst the Council of Soissons (744) seems to assert the absolute indissolubility of matrimony,[461] those of Verberie (756)[462] and Compiègne (757)[463] are less exacting. For many years and in various places people opposed the Roman discipline.

As it had a religious significance, marriage was usually blessed by the Church.[464] Even though there was no abso-

[456] Bede, *Hist. eccles.*, IV, 5, col. 182.

[457] Cf. the seventh *capitulum* of Pope Zachary in the year 747 (Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des conciles*, III, 2, p. 890).

[458] Canon 8 (Mansi, III, 806, CII). St. Isidore, who quotes this canon, ascribes it to a council of Milevis.

[459] *De eccles. offic.*, II, 20, 12.

[460] Canon 10.

[461] Canon 9 (Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des conc.*, III, 2, p. 858, 859).

[462] Canon 9 (Hefele-Leclercq, *ibid.*, p. 919).

[463] Canons 11 and 19 (Hefele-Leclercq, *ibid.*, p. 942, 943).

[464] St. Isidore, *De eccles. offic.*, II, 20, 5: "Connubia a sacerdote benedicuntur."

lute and formal law on this point, Christians realized the importance of the marriage ceremony, so much so that the fear of being deprived thereof made upon them a salutary impression.[465] Besides, in accordance with St. Augustine, they were forcefully reminded that conjugal relations are fully justified only by the intention of begetting children, and that, outside of that purpose, they always entail some venial fault, because they result from inordinate concupiscence.[466]

There still remains the question of canonical marriage impediments. During the period we are now considering, these impediments were formulated with greater precision, and began to be codified in papal decretals and conciliary canons.[467] It is not within the scope of this work to give their history. We shall merely observe that the diversity found in this matter between the various countries may be accounted for by the diversity of customs from which the Church borrowed her laws, and by the character of the peoples for which these laws were intended.

[465] St. Cæsarius, *Sermo* CLXXXVIII, 5; CLXXXIX, 5.

[466] St. Cæsarius, *Sermo* CLXXXVIII, 4; St. Gregory, *Moral.*, XXXII, 39; *Epist.* XI, 64, col. 1197; St. Isidore, *De eccles. offic.*, II, 20, 10.

[467] Cf., for instance, St. Gregory, *Epist.*, VII, 1; XI, 64 (col. 1189); *Regula pastoralis*, III, 27 (col. 104); *Councils of Agde*, can. 61; *Orleans* (511), can. 18; *Epaon* (517), can. 30; *Clermont* (535), can. 12; *Toledo* (527 or 531), can. 5 (Mansi, VIII, 335, 354, 562, 861, 786); St. Boniface, *Allocutio sacerdotum de coniugiis illicitis ad plebem* (*P. L.*, LXXXIX, col. 819). We give this text as a specimen of many others: "Ne quis polluatur cum matre, non cum noverca, non cum sorore ex patre nata, non cum sorore ex matre nata, sive intus sive foris nata sit. Non cum filia filii filiae, non cum nepte ex filia nata, non cum filia novercae, non cum sorore patris, non cum sorore matris, non cum uxore patrui, non cum nuru, non cum uxore fratris, non cum filia uxoris, non cum filia filii uxoris tuae, non cum filia filiae eius, non cum sorore uxoris tuae . . . non cum socru tua. . . . Non vir cum filia et matre, non cum uxore avunculi tui."

§ 12. Mariology. Honors paid to the Saints. Christian Practices.

The Christological controversies and the assertion of the θεοτόκος had produced but little stir in the Latin Church. However, piety towards Mary, of which we noticed the earliest developments during the 4th century, steadily increased in consequence of the new definitions of councils and the attention paid to the extraordinary privileges of Our Lady. Her divine maternity had already been defined; her virginity *ante partum, in partu, post partum,* although not so directly and solemnly defined, was held as an intangible belief. "Integra fide credendum est," writes Gennadius, "beatam Mariam Dei Christi matrem et virginem concepisse, et virginem genuisse, et post partum virginem permansisse."[468] One point, however, which was discussed later on between Ratramnus and Paschasius Radbertus, still remained undecided, *viz.,* whether Jesus had miraculously left His mother's womb without opening it (*uterus clausus*), just as He afterwards passed through the door of the upper room, or whether He was born of her in the natural way, without taint to her virginity. The authors of whom we are speaking hold various views. St. Fulgentius seems to admit the latter hypothesis;[469] St. Maximus of Turin and St. Gregory, the former;[470] however, St. Ildefonsus, who inclines towards it, writes more reservedly as follows:

[468] *De eccles. dogm.,* 69; St. Peter Chrys., *Sermo* CXVIII (col. 521); LXII (col. 374); St. Maximus of Turin, *Homil.* V (col. 235); St. Fulgent., *De verit. praedestin.,* I, 5; St. Ildefonsus, *Liber de virgin. perpet. sanctae Mariae.*

[469] "Solus est [Christus] masculus adaperiens vulvam qui in veritate sanctus Domino vocaretur. Vulvam quippe matris eius non concupiscentia mariti cocumbentis, sed omnipotentia Filii nascentis aperuit" (*Epist.* XVII, 27).

[470] St. Maximus, *Sermo* LIII (col. 638, 639); St. Gregory, *In evang. homil.* XXVI, 1.

"Qualiter introierit [Christus] nemo novit; qualiter exierit egressio sola cognoscit." [471]

As St. Augustine had asserted that the thought of (actual) sin ought to be in no way associated with the mother of God, the belief that Mary had gone perfectly stainless through life, could not but grow. St. Cæsarius says: "Absque contagione vel macula peccati [Maria] perduravit." [472] Those few writers who suppose that the Blessed Virgin has been purified in view of or by her Son's conception, seem to understand this cleansing either of original sin or of the stain which results from the indeliberate motions of concupiscence.[473]

For our authors do not go to the extent of declaring the Blessed Virgin free from hereditary sin. By making the birth *ex virgine* the condition of that exemption, St. Augustine had laid down a principle which was accepted too faithfully till St. Anselm, and even beyond his time, and thus checked the growth of the belief in the Immaculate Conception. "Caro quippe Mariae," writes St. Fulgentius, "quae in iniquitatibus humana fuerat solemnitate concepta, caro fuit utique peccati, quae Filium Dei genuit in similitudinem carnis peccati." [474]

On the other hand, Mary's share in the work of the redemption is thrown into relief. Not only is the old parallel,

[471] *Liber de virginitate perpetua,* II, col. 61; cf. VI, col. 75.

[472] *Sermo* CCXLIV, 1 (*P. L.,* XXXIX).

[473] St. Leo, *Sermo* XXII, 3; St. Ildefons., *Lib. de virg. perp.,* II, col. 61; St. Bede: "Superveniens in virginem Spiritus sanctus . . . mentem illius . . . ab omni vitiorum sorde castificavit, ut caelesti digna esset partu. . . . Spiritus sanctus cor illius cum implevit, ab omni aestu concupiscentiae carnalis temperavit, emundavit a desideriis temporalibus ac donis caelestibus mentem simul consecravit et corpus" (*Homil.* I, 1, col. 12, 13).

[474] *Epist.* XVII, 13; Fulgent. Ferrand., *Epist.* III, 4; cf. St. Leo, *Sermo* XXIV, 3; St. Gregory, *Moral.,* XVIII, 84; St. Bede, *Homil.* I, 1, col. 13.

already known in the 2d century, between Eve and Mary reproduced, but its consequences are developed: "Ob hoc namque Christus nasci voluit," St. Peter Chrysologus declares, "ut sicut per Evam venit ad omnes mors, ita per Mariam rediret omnibus vita." [475] "Iam veni mecum ad hanc Virginem," St. Ildefonsus declares to his Jewish opponent, "ne sine hac properes ad gehennam." [476]

From the truly Oriental effusions which we find in St. Ildefonsus' *Liber de virginitate perpetua sanctae Mariae,* we may judge of the intense piety which, during the 7th century, drew some souls to the Blessed Virgin. However, it was only then that, in addition to the special commemoration of the Virgin Mother on January 1, the Roman Church received from Byzantium the four feasts of Mary's Purification, Annunciation, Nativity, and "Dormitio." In Gaul, as early as the 6th century, there was kept, about the middle of January, another feast, which a council of Toledo in the year 656 assigned for Spain to December 18.[477]

Side by side with the veneration of the Blessed Virgin, there grows up the veneration of the saints, chiefly of the holy martyrs, but also of the most illustrious confessors, and the veneration of their relics. The people honor the saints, they invoke them and place confidence in their intercession:

"[Deus] est mirabilis in sanctis suis, in quibus nobis et praesidium constituit et exemplum. . . . Cuius [beati Laurentii] oratione et patrocinio adiuvari nos sine cessatione confidi-

[475] *Sermo* XCIX, col. 479; St. Maximus of Turin, *Homil.* XV, col. 254.

[476] *Liber de virgin. perpet.,* IV, col. 69.

[477] Cf. L. Duchesne, *Les origines du culte chrétien,* p. 258–262 (English transl., p. 269–273). The story of Mary's resurrection and assumption was known through several Latin recensions of the Κοίμησις Μαρίας. The decree of Gelasius notes one of these recensions: "Liber qui appellatur *Transitus,* id est *assumptio sanctae Mariae* apocryphus."

mus." [478]—"Quisquis ergo honorat martyres honorat et Christum, et qui spernit sanctos spernit Dominum nostrum." [479] —"Sanctorum corpora et praecipue beatorum martyrum reliquias, ac si Christi membra sincerissime honoranda . . . credimus." [480]

However, St. Gregory acknowledges the veneration of relics as legitimate on one condition only, *viz.*, that they are certainly authentic.[481] St. Isidore explains the nature of the worship paid to the saints. First, are commemorated the apostles and martyrs, though sacrifice is offered to God alone. Then:

"Colimus ergo martyres eo cultu dilectionis et societatis quo in hac vita coluntur sancti homines Dei . . . sed illos tanto devotius quanto securius post certamina superata. . . . At vero illo cultu, quae graece latria dicitur, latine uno verbo dici non potest, cum sit quaedam propriae Divinitati debita servitus, nec colimus nec colendum docemus nisi unum Deum. . . . Honorandi sunt ergo martyres propter imitationem, non adorandi propter religionem, honorandi charitate, non servitute." [482]

To these practices, closely related to dogma, were added many others, more or less directly based on dogma, particularly on belief in the supernatural efficacy of the Church's prayers and blessings, and on faith in the continual exercise of divine Providence over the whole world, particularly over Christians. These pious practices, which are often mentioned in St. Gregory's letters and dialogues, were not always free from excess and abuses; and in order to realize what a deluge of superstitions threatened to whelm the faith and morals of the simple-minded Christians of that

[478] St. Leo, *Sermo* LXXXV, 4; cf. LXXXIV, 2.
[479] St. Maximus of Turin, *Sermo* LXIX, col. 675.
[480] Gennad., *De eccles. dogm.*, 69; St. Maximus of Tur., *Sermo* LXXXVIII, col. 710; St. Gregory, *Moral.*, XVI, 64; cf. *Epist.* IV, 30.
[481] *Epist.* XI, 64, col. 1193.
[482] *De eccles. offic.*, I, 35, 1–6. The veneration of images will be considered *infra*.

time, one has but to go through the councils of the Merovingian epoch, the prohibitions enacted by the penitentials, or the statutes promulgated by the apostles of barbarian nations, for instance, St. Boniface. But it would be sheer injustice to hold the Church responsible for corruptions which she never ceased to condemn and which were, in most cases, the remnants of a half-extinct paganism.

Lastly, we may mention the growth of monasticism in the Latin Church. A fuller realization of the superiority of virginity over the married state [483] combined, in the minds of many of the faithful, with a deep sense of the need of penance, led to the foundation of a great many monasteries, where men and women strove to lead a more perfect life. In the midst of the decadence of the subsequent ages, these peaceful abodes preserved the remnants of ancient thought and harbored the germs of Christian civilization.

§ 13. Eschatology.

In the domain of eschatology St. Augustine had stemmed the Origenist revival in the West at the end of the 4th century, and had clearly set forth the teaching on purgatory, which before his time had been but imperfectly realized. By stating this doctrine with still greater accuracy and developing that of the immediate retribution after death, the theologians who followed in his footsteps gave to eschatology its almost complete and definitive form.

Death, St. Julian of Toledo declares, is not a good in itself; but it is "plerumque bonis bona, quia per eam pertransitur ad immortalitatem futuram."[484]

[483] Cassian, *Col.* XXII, 6; St. Peter Chrysol., *Sermo* CXLIII, col. 583; Gennad., *De eccles. dogm.* 65, 68; St. Fulgentius, *Epist.* II, 10; *De Trinitate,* XII; etc.

[484] *Prognosticon,* I, 8.

That all men must die, was generally admitted in the West. However, Gennadius observes that this is not a dogma, since some Catholic authors, "eruditi viri," believe that the "commutatio" which will take place in those who may be still living on the last day, will stand them in stead of the resurrection.[485]

Death is followed by a particular judgment. St. Cæsarius is perhaps the first expressly to mention this,[486] although it is implied in the doctrine of retribution immediately after death. With the exception of Cassian, who asserts that, before the general judgment, the souls receive only a foretaste of what is in store for them,[487] the writers of whom we are speaking agree in affirming that the souls receive their whole reward or punishment immediately after death: "Quando caro, quae modo tantum diligitur," says Cæsarius, "vermibus coeperit devorari in sepulcro, anima Deo ab angelis praesentatur in caelo, et ibi iam, si bona fuerit, coronatur, aut si mala, in tenebras proiicitur." [488]

However, there is one exception, *viz.*, when the soul, though it is in the state of justice, has been too much attached to the goods of this world, and is stained with little sins, for which it has not sufficiently atoned by prayer and alms. Then its happiness is delayed and it must be cleansed by suffering before it can enter into heaven. This is the doctrine of purgatory, which we find explicitly stated by St. Cæsarius,[489] St. Gregory,[490] and the writers who follow

[485] *De eccles. dogm.*, 7. Gennadius is alluding to the Greek opinion and to the original text of 1 *Corinth.*, XV, 51.

[486] *Sermo* CCCI, 5.

[487] *Coll.*, I, 14.

[488] *Sermo* CCCI, 5. Cf. Gennad., *De eccles. dogm.*, 79; St. Gregory, *Moral.*, IV, 56; XIII, 48; *In evang. homil.* XIX, 4; *Dialog.*, IV, 28; St. Isidore, *Sentent.*, I, 14, 16; St. Julian, *Prognost.*, II, 13; St. Bede, *Hist. eccles.* V, 12, col. 250.

[489] *Sermo* CIV, 1, 5; CCLII, 3.

[490] *Dialog.*, IV, 25, 39; cf. 40.

in his wake, *viz.:* St. Isidore,[491] St. Julian of Toledo,[492] and the Venerable Bede.[493] Grievous sins (*peccata capitalia*) that have not been expiated, lead to death; slight sins (*peccata minuta*),[494] that have not been expiated, lead to the "ignis purgatorius." The sufferings that are inflicted by the latter are terrible, and St. Cæsarius, who has more than once heard people expressing carelessness in regard to purgatory ("Non pertinet ad me quamdiu moras habeam, si tamen ad vitam aeternam perrexero"), denounces them with severity and asserts that "ille purgatorius ignis durior erit quam quidquid potest in hoc saeculo poenarum aut cogitari, aut videri, aut sentiri." [495] It is a river of fire which the soul has to cross and recross till it is perfectly cleansed.[496] St. Bede thinks that, unless their sufferings are shortened by the prayers, almsdeeds, and suffrages of the faithful, some souls will stay in purgatory till the last judgment, especially those which have done penance only at the moment of death.[497]

[491] *De eccles. offic.*, I, 18, 12; *De ordine creatur.*, XIV, 6–12.

[492] *Prognost.*, II, 9, 10, 19, 22.

[493] *Homil.* I, 4, col. 30; *Hist. eccles.*, V, 12, col. 248 and foll.

[494] See a list of these sins in St. Cæsarius, *Sermo* CIV, 3; St. Isidore, *De ord. creatur.*, XIV, 11.

[495] *Sermo* CIV, 5; St. Isidore, *De ordine creatur.*, XIV, 12.

[496] *Sermo* CCLII, 3; CIV, 5; St. Julian, *Prognost.*, II, 22.

[497] *Homil.*, I, 4, col. 30; *Hist. eccles.*, V, 12, col. 250. In the same chapter of his *Ecclesiastical History*, St. Bede relates the vision of a Christian who had returned to life, after seeing purgatory and hell. Purgatory consists of two distinct places. In one, by the side of clouds of devouring flames, there blow stormy winds, loaded with snow and frost, and the souls go without rest from intense heat to intense cold. These are: "animae illorum qui, differentes confiteri et emendare scelera quae fecerant, in ipso tandem mortis articulo ad paenitentiam confugiunt, et sic de corpore exeunt: qui tamen, quia confessionem et paenitentiam vel in morte habuerunt, omnes in die iudicii ad regnum caelorum perveniunt." The other place on the contrary is pleasant, adorned with flowers and full of joy: "ipse est in quo recipiuntur animae eorum qui in bonis quidem operibus de corpore

But, as Bede declares, those poor souls can be helped and delivered more speedily from their sufferings, by the prayers, almsdeeds and good works performed on their behalf, and by the offering of the holy sacrifice of the Mass.[498] On the other hand, relying on the authority of the men of old, and on the practice of the faithful, St. Julian declares, though somewhat timidly, that the souls in purgatory can pray for the living and help them.[499]

Whatever its duration, purgatory constitutes but a passing state for man after death. It is either in heaven or hell that his life receives its definitive sanction.

Hell is the place where those who die before atoning for their *peccata capitalia* are chastised. The error of those who showed mercy to the damned is plainly discarded. Neither faith nor baptism suffices for salvation; one must also avoid sin and do good.[500] Obstinate sinners are cast into hell as soon as they die,[501] there to endure the severest sufferings. The authors before us do not cease to expatiate on the rigor of these sufferings: "Mentem urit tristitia et corpus flamma."[502] The damned endure hunger and

exeunt, non tamen sunt tantae perfectionis ut in regnum caelorum statim mereantur introduci: qui tamen omnes in die iudicii ad visionem Christi et gaudia regni caelestis intrabunt. Nam quicumque in omni verbo et opere et cogitatione perfecti sunt, mox de corpore egressi ad regnum caeleste perveniunt." In truth, this latter place does not deserve to be called *purgatory* at all; it is rather a reminiscence of the blissful abodes where the just were supposed to dwell, according to the view which asserted that only apostles and martyrs entered immediately into heaven. Cf. a similar vision in St. Boniface, *Epist.* XX (*P. L.*, LXXXIX, 713).

[498] Cf. also St. Gregory, *Dialog.*, IV, 55; St. Julian, *Prognost.*, I, 21.

[499] *Prognost.*, II, 26.

[500] Faust., *Epist.* V (p. 184); St. Fulgent., *De remiss. peccat.*, II, 13; St. Gregory, *In Ezechiel.*, I, homil. IX, 4; *Epist.* VII, 15; St. Cæsar., *Homil.* XVII, col. 1080.

[501] St. Gregory, *Dialog.*, IV, 28; St. Julian, *Prognost.*, II, 13.

[502] St. Isidore, *Sentent.*, I, 28, 1.

thirst; they are pitied in no way by the elect;[503] above all, they are consumed by fire, a fire that needs no fuel to burn unceasingly, and tortures the spiritual souls as well as the demons.[504] Whilst their sufferings are, of course, varied and proportionate to the guilt of each ("impios dispar poena constringit"),[505] they agree in this that all are eternal. That truth, which some denied, even after St. Augustine's forcible argumentation,[506] was vividly inculcated again and again by Holy Church through the pen of her doctors. Says St. Fulgentius: "In retributione, [reprobi] nec immortales nec incorruptibiles erunt; sed corrumpentur, nec consumentur; morientur, non exstinguentur. . . . Ibi mors animae corporisque non moritur, quia cruciatus corporis et animae non finitur."[507] Cassiodorus: "Dolor sine fine, poena sine requie, afflictio sine spe, malum incommutabile."[508] "Iste tamen ignis sic absumit ut servet; sic servat ut cruciet; dabiturque miseris vita mortalis et poena servatrix."[509] St. Gregory: "[Reprobus] cruciatur et non exstinguitur, moritur et vivit, deficit et subsistit, finitur semper et sine fine est."[510]

The happiness of the elect is contrasted with the misery of the reprobates. Immediately after death the souls of

[503] St. Gregory, *Moral.*, VI, 47, 48.

[504] St. Gregory, *Moral.*, XV, 35; *Dialog.*, IV, 29; St. Julian, *Prognost.*, II, 17; III, 41.

[505] Cassiodorus, *De anima*, XII, col. 1302; Faust., *Epist.* V, p. 193; St. Julian, *Progn.*, III, 42; St. Cæsar., *Homil.* XVII, col. 1080.

[506] Cf. St. Gregory, *Moral.*, XXXIV, 34–38; *Dialog.*, IV, 44. The Pope refutes the objections of the *merciful.*

[507] *De remiss. peccat.*, II, 13.

[508] *De anima*, XII, col. 1302.

[509] *In psalm.* XX, vers. 10.

[510] *Moral.*, XV, 21; cf. also St. Maximus of Turin, *Tract.* IV, col. 792; *Tract.* II *De baptismo*, col. 777; Faustus, *Epist.* V, p. 194 and foll.

the just, that have nothing to atone for, enter into heaven.[511] Salvian [512] and Cassiodorus [513] describe their beatitude. Its main element is the sight of Jesus Christ and His holy humanity,[514] nay the intuitive vision of God Himself.[515] The elect behold God, not "in eius claritate," but "in eius natura"; they behold the mysteries of the Trinity, the generation of the Son, the procession of the Holy Ghost, the consubstantiality and unity of the three divine Persons;[516] and by inflaming their love, that sight imparts to them an unalloyed and unending joy: "Remuneratio sanctorum visio Dei est, quae nobis ineffabile gaudium exhibebit." [517] "Ibi vacabimus et videbimus, videbimus et amabimus, amabimus et laudabimus. Ecce quod erit in fine sine fine. Nunquid alius est noster finis, nisi pervenire ad regnum cuius nullus est finis?" [518]

However, though substantially the same for all the elect, the vision of God will be for each more or less perfect, according to his deserts, and give him a degree of beatitude in exact proportion to his merits.[519] That essential beatitude will be accompanied by secondary joys and privileges which, whilst not really increasing it, will extend it. In heaven, we shall know one another.[520]

[511] St. Gregory, *Moral.*, IV, 56; XIII, 48; *In evang. homil.* XIX, 4; St. Isidore, *Sentent.*, I, 14, 16; St. Julian, *Prognost.*, II, 1, 8, 12, 37.

[512] *Adv. avaritiam*, II, 10.

[513] *In psalm.* XXXVI, vers. 12; LXXXVI, vers. 7; *De anima*, XII.

[514] St. Maximus of Turin, *Sermo* XLVII, col. 629.

[515] Cassiodorus, *De anima*, XII, col. 1304; St. Isidore, *De ordine creatur.*, XV, 6, 7.

[516] St. Gregory, *Moral.*, XVIII, 90; XXX, 17. St. Julian asks himself whether the just shall see God with their bodily eyes after the resurrection; his answer to this question is the same as St. Augustine's (*Prognost.*, III, 54; cf. vol. II, p. 430).

[517] St. Julian, *Prognost.*, III, 50, 55.

[518] *Ibid.*, 62.

[519] St. Gregory, *In Ezechiel.*, II, homil. IV, 6.

[520] St. Gregory, *Dialog.* IV, 33; St. Julian, *Prognost.*, II, 24.

Both the beatitude of the just and the punishment of the wicked will not be complete until after the resurrection of the body and the last judgment, when the body will share the reward or the chastisement of the soul which animated it. When will that resurrection and judgment take place? According to Cassiodorus, it is useless to speculate on this head.[521] St. Leo and St. Gregory, in spite of expectations that have proved false many and many a time, are firmly convinced that the end of the world and the coming of the supreme Judge are close at hand.[522]

The resurrection of the dead will be, then, the first act of the supreme tragedy. Christian authors have always recalled that belief with special fondness, in order either to set forth its consoling side or to answer the objections raised against it. They did not fail to set themselves to that task during the epoch that lasts from the 5th to the 8th century.[523] All men, good and bad,[524] shall arise at the same time, in the body that was theirs during life: "Eadem caro corruptibilis quae cadit, tam iustorum quam iniustorum incorruptibilis resurget";[525] and in the same sex;[526] but, at least in the just, there will be a *commutatio,* which, whilst not changing the nature of their bodies, will

[521] *In psalm.* VI, Prooem.

[522] St. Leo, *Sermo* XIX, 1; St. Gregory, *In evang. homil.* I, 5; IV, 2; *Epist.* III, 29; etc.

[523] St. Peter Chrys., *Sermo* CXVIII; St. Maximus of Tur., *Homil.* LXXXIII, col. 438, 439; *Sermo* LXVI, col. 665; St. Gregory, *Moral.,* XIV, 69, 70, 75; *In evang. homil.* XXVI, 12; St. Julian, *Prognost.,* III, 14.

[524] Gennad., *De eccles. dogm.,* 6; St. Julian, *Prognost.,* III, 16.

[525] Gennad., *De eccles. dogm.,* 6; St. Gregory, *Moral.,* XIV, 71–77; St. Isidore, *De eccles. offic.,* II, 24, 7; St. Julian, *Prognost.,* III, 17.

[526] Gennadius, *De eccles. dogm.,* 77; St. Fulgentius, *De fide,* 35; St. Julian, *Prognost.,* III, 24. In that passage (16–31), the reader may see all the various questions that St. Julian asks himself in connection with the resurrection.

make them youthful, immortal, glorious and free from defects and infirmities: "non naturam aut sexum mutantes, sed tantum fragilitatem et vitia deponentes." [527]

The general judgment will be the next act of the final drama. Except for those who may be still living at the end of the world, God will then merely proclaim in solemn fashion the sentence pronounced at the particular judgment of each. St. Gregory describes this judgment in his *Moralia,* XVII, 54 and XXXIII, 37; in book XXVI, 50, 51 of the same work, he divides men into four categories. Among the elect, some reign and are judged: they are the ordinary Christians, who, after sinning, have done penance; others reign and judge, but are not judged: they are the perfect who have lived according to the evangelical counsels. Likewise, among the reprobates, some perish and are not judged: they are the wicked and idolaters who have not known God; others perish and are judged: they are the bad Christians.[528]

After the sentence of each has been pronounced, and his fate determined, the consummation will take place. Heaven and earth will apparently disappear; in reality, they will not perish, but will be renewed and transformed so as to be more in harmony with the state of the blessed: "non ut non sint, sed ut aliter sint, novatione scilicet substantiae, non defectione naturae"; "in melius commutanda." [529]

[527] St. Isidore, *De eccles. offic.,* II, 24; *Sentent.,* I, 26, 2; St. Fulgentius, *De fide,* 35; *De Trinit.,* XIII; St. Gregory, *Moral.,* XIV, 71–77; St. Julian, *Prognost.,* III, 16.

[528] The reader may recognize here, at least in part, an old topic, that had been already developed during the 4th century. The same division is found in St. Isidore, *Sentent.,* I, 27, 10; St. Julian, *Prognost.,* III, 33; St. Bede, *Homil.,* II, 17, col. 225.

[529] St. Prosper, *In psalm.* CI, vers. 26–28; Gennad., *De eccles. dogm.,* 70; St. Maximus of Tur., *Sermo* LXVI, col. 665; St. Julian, *Prognost.,* III, 46, 47.

It can be said without exaggeration that the doctrine and spirit of St. Augustine have deeply influenced the whole teaching of the Latin writers that came after him; nowhere however, is his influence more apparent than in eschatology.

CHAPTER X

THE IMAGE CONTROVERSY

§ 1. Use and Veneration of Images from the First to the Fifth Century.

NOTHING has been said, as yet, of the veneration paid to images in the Church. As that question became the subject of a well-defined discussion during the 8th and 9th centuries, we have thought it better to group together in one special chapter all that refers to it.

Use and *veneration* are not the same thing, and therefore must be distinguished. The Iconoclasts, strictly so-called, accepted neither the use nor the veneration of religious images. Others, who were not so rigorous, whilst accepting the use of images, refused them veneration. The object of the dispute among Orientals was both the veneration and the use; Occidentals and Byzantines fought only on the question of veneration.[1]

The Old Testament seems absolutely to forbid, not only the veneration, but even the use of figured images and

[1] In order to help those who may not be familiar with these studies, I take the liberty to explain in a few words the theoretical question. From the viewpoint of *use,* religious images (paintings or sculptures) can be employed for a threefold purpose: (1) to *adorn:* they adorn the places where they are; (2) to *instruct:* they appeal to the eyes of the ignorant and teach them the mysteries of faith; (3) to *excite piety:* by placing before us the Gospel scenes, the history and features of the saints, the representation of Christian beliefs, they beget religious sentiments of love, respect, etc., towards God, His mysteries and saints.— *Veneration,* properly so called, consists in paying to the image an external homage that is internally addressed to him whom

representations.[2] However, either that prohibition was not as absolute as it seems,[3] or it was taken strictly only after the age of the Maccabees.[4] It was not renewed by the New Testament, and, therefore, from the beginning of the Church, we see Christian art bent on adorning the places of worship with religious paintings, sculpturing sarcophagi, and engraving medals. Of these early attempts the main and the oldest — though not the only — witnesses are the Roman catacombs.[5] The paintings found therein have been

it represents. The image is deemed to hold the place of the original and to present him or her to us; he or she it is whom we see in it, and it is to him or her that, through it, we address our homages and prayers; he or she is their direct and primary object; the image itself is but their accidental and indirect object. Thus understood, veneration can be given, strictly speaking, only to those personages whose image is under our eyes: not even religious historical scenes can be truly the object of veneration. Apart from this principal and strictly so called veneration of images, theological writers distinguish another, which has for its direct object the material object itself — whether it is a painting or sculpture. Of course a piece of cloth or marble is in itself inert matter; however, by the fact of its reproducing the image of a holy person, it has acquired so close a relation to him or her that it is entitled to respect. We cannot treat it as a common object; else our indifference or contempt would fall in some way on the person whose image it bears. We must pay to it some regard, *in se,* though not *propter se.* Of course, this latter form of veneration is far inferior to that which has been mentioned above, although it rests ultimately on the same foundation. Cf. Franzelin, *De Verbo incarnato,* thesis XLV, p. 457–459; Pohle-Preuss, *Mariology,* pp. 139–181, St. Louis, 1914.

[2] *Exodus,* XX, 4.

[3] *Exodus,* XXV, 18, 19; XXXVII, 7–9; *Numbers,* XXI, 8, 9; III *Kings,* VII, 25.

[4] Josephus, *Antiqu.,* VIII, cap. 7, § 5; XV, cap. 8, §§ 1, 2; XVIII, cap. 6, § 3; *De bello iudaico,* I, cap. 33, §§ 2, 3; Origen, *Contra Cels.,* IV, 31.

[5] Cf. De Rossi, *Roma sotterranea,* Romae, 1864, and foll., and the works that depend upon it or are its continuation. Brownlow-Northcote, *Roma sotterranea,* London, 1869; F. X. Kraus, *Roma sotterranea,* Freiburg-im-Br., 2d edit., 1879. H. Marrucchi, *Eléments d'archéologie chrétienne,* Rome-Paris, 1900–1902. Sixtus Scaglia, *Notiones archæolo-*

divided into six categories: (1) Symbolic subjects, objects and animals symbolizing Christian personages or mysteries (the anchor, the lamb, the dove, the fish, etc.); (2) allegorical subjects, representing the parables of our Lord and the figures under which He describes Himself (the vine, the good shepherd, the wise and foolish virgins); (3) biblical subjects of the Old Testament (Noah in the ark, Daniel, Jonas, Moses striking the rock). There are still extant instances of these first three categories of subjects, dating back to the 1st and 2d centuries. (4) Direct images of our Lord, the Blessed Virgin and the saints. These images, which are on the whole more recent than the preceding, and also more important for our subject, are either painted on the stucco of the walls or on a groundwork of golden glass, or stamped in the shape of medals; some specimens of these images seem to date back to the apostolic age, or to the 1st and 2nd centuries, although they belong mainly to the 3d and 4th. (5) Lastly, liturgical subjects, of which the most remarkable instances are found in the so-called chambers of the sacraments in the cemetery of Callixtus (Moses striking the rock, a fisherman drawing a fish out of the water, baptism, the eucharistic sacrifice, the meal of the seven disciples before the bread and fish, etc.)

If to these figured representations found in the catacombs be added the sculptures of sarcophagi (mostly of the 4th or 5th century), and some statues of the Good Shepherd, of which two at least seem anterior to Constantine, the reader will have an idea of the testimony which the oldest Christian monuments supply to prove that the Church has made use of religious images from the very beginning.

This testimony of the monuments is confirmed by some texts of Church writers. Even if we ignore the text of

giae christianae disciplinis theologicis co-ordinatae, Romae, 1908 and foll.

Eusebius concerning the statue erected to our Lord at Paneas by the woman with an issue of blood,[6] that of St. Irenæus about the images honored by the Carpocratians,[7] and that of Lampridius on the statues of Abraham and Jesus placed by Alexander Severus (222–235) in his *lararium*,[8] we have Tertullian speaking of the representation of the Good Shepherd on chalices,[9] and Eusebius declaring that he himself has seen painted images of Sts. Peter and Paul and of Jesus.[10]

Thus, during the first three centuries, the *use* of images is established almost in the whole Church,[11] and apparently without any serious opposition. Whilst some authors, like Clement of Alexandria[12] and Tertullian,[13] understand the Old Testament prohibition literally and seem to regard it as still binding; and whilst Clement of Alexandria,[14] Minutius Felix,[15] Arnobius[16] and Lactantius[17] do not think it possible and lawful to represent God under a human guise, these protestations or restrictions have no influence whatever on the piety of the faithful nor on the vigilance of their spiritual guides. The use of figured representations was intro-

[6] *Hist. eccles.*, VII, 18.
[7] *Adv. haeres.*, I, 25.
[8] *Alexander Severus*, 29.
[9] *De pudicitia*, 7, 10.
[10] *Hist. eccles.*, VII, 18. Photius (*Biblioth.*, col. 119) observes that the work of Pierius of Alexandria on St. Luke contained a passage that served to justify the veneration of images; but he does not quote the passage.
[11] See in Brownlow-Northcote, *op. cit.*, p. 221 and Kraus, *op. cit.*, p. 216, the fresco of the catacomb of Alexandria, which, according to De Rossi, was produced during the first half of the 4th century, or perhaps even in the 3d.
[12] *Cohort. ad gent.*, IV (*P. G.*, VIII, 161).
[13] *De idololatria*, 4; *De spectaculis*, 23; *Adv. Hermogenem*, 1.
[14] *Stromata*, VII, 5 (*P. G.*, IX, 437).
[15] *Octavius*, 32.
[16] *Adv. gentes*, I, 31.
[17] *Institutiones*, II, 2.

duced into the Church neither by a struggle nor by surprise or stealth. At once and from the very beginning the Church accepted art and made use of it.

The Church, then, *used* images. But did she *venerate* them from the beginning? There is no text that enables us positively to affirm that she did. In the discussion that runs through the *Octavius,* the pagan Cæcilius says to Octavius (12): "Iam non adorandae sed subeundae cruces"; and Octavius replies (29): "Cruces etiam nec colimus nec optamus." Cæcilius had apparently said that Christians venerated all kinds of crosses: this Octavius denies, and immediately goes on to show that the image of the cross can be found in a great many things. Hence neither the reproach of the one nor the denial of the other have a definite bearing on the subject before us.[18] Moreover, we may reasonably believe that Christians were deterred from honoring images, lest, by doing so, they should seem to follow in the steps of the heathen, who worshiped idols. This danger the apologists denounce vigorously.[19] Christians must not imagine that statues or images are gods, nor render to them a veneration that would imply that they are divine. As it is easy to pass from legitimate worship to idolatry, the faithful must always be on their guard.

Meanwhile Constantine had restored peace to the Church, and Christian worship, till then more or less confined to secret places, took place openly and in splendid basilicas. We need not dwell on the many representations of the cross so popular during the 4th and 5th centuries.[20]

[18] The adoration of the cross was one of the "stupidities" for which the heathen upbraided the Christians (cf. TERTULLIAN, *Apolog.,* 16). We observe that, in this question of image veneration, the veneration of the cross has a special importance and therefore must be considered by itself.

[19] Cf. ORIGEN, *Contra Celsum,* VII, 66.

[20] The fully developed cross (*crux immissa*) hardly appears before

Heaven itself seemed to give the example by the miraculous apparitions of that sign of our salvation.[21] Hence many Christians are busily engaged in painting it on the walls, carving it in wood or stone, and casting it in metals.[22] The frequency and the continuousness of these reproductions is attested in the East by Asterius of Amasea,[23] St. John Chrysostom[24] and Julian the Apostate;[25] in the West, by St. Augustine[26] and others.

That some veneration was paid to images of the cross seems certain. In the passage just referred to, Julian (+ 363) upbraids the Christians for adoring the wood of the cross and painting its image on their houses: Τὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ προσκυνεῖτε ξύλον, εἰκόνας αὐτοῦ σκιαγραφοῦντες ἐν τῷ μετώπῳ, καὶ πρὸ τῶν οἰκημάτων ἐγγράφοντες.[27] At the end of the same century, describing certain paintings representing the martyrdom of St. Euphemia, Asterius of Amasea speaks of that sign (of the cross) which Christians are wont to adore (προσκυνεῖσθαι) and paint.[28] During the 5th century Theo-

the 4th century (however, there is a specimen of it, dating back to the 2d or 3d century; cf. Brownlow-Northcote, *op. cit.*, p. 230). Before that time, it is generally concealed under the figure of the Greek letter Tau, or of lines that cross each other. Cf. L. Bréhier, *Les origines du crucifix*, Paris (Collect. *Science et religion*).

[21] Cf. Eusebius, *De vita Constantini*, I, 28, 2 (τούτῳ νίκα); St. Cyril of Jerus., *Epist. ad Constantium* (doubtfully authentic), 3–5 (*P. G.*, XXXIII, 1168, 1169, apparition of an immense cross in heaven); St. Gregory of Naz., *Orat.* IV, 54 (*P. G.*, XXXV, 577, apparition of a cross to Julian the Apostate).

[22] Cf. Martigny, *Diction. des antiq. chrétiennes*, 2d edit., artic. *Croix*.

[23] *In laudem sanctae Euphemiae* (*P. G.*, XL, 337).

[24] *Quod Christus sit Deus*, 9 (*P. G.*, XLVIII, 826).

[25] *Apud* Cyrill. Alex., *Contra Iulian.*, VI (*P. G.*, LXXVI, 796, 797).

[26] *Sermo* LXXXVIII, 9; *Tract. in Ioann.* CVII, 3.

[27] *Ap.* Cyrill. Alex., *Contra Iulian.*, VI, *loc. cit.* Most probably the wood of the cross, spoken of by Julian, is not that of the true cross.

[28] *In laudem sanctae Euphemiae, loc. cit.*

doret mentions the honor that was paid to the sign of the cross by Greeks and barbarians: Τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον θεολογοῦντες καὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ τὸ σημεῖον γεραίροντες.[29] In the West, Prudentius (+ 410–415) tells us of the emperors adoring the cross,[30] and St. Jerome refers to the cross the *Adorate scabellum pedum eius* of Psalm XCVIII,[31] although neither defines what cross he has in view.

Coming to the strictly so-called images of Jesus, the Blessed Virgin, and the saints, the testimonies that either assert or imply the use of religious images in Christian life and worship are very many. We shall merely notice the testimonies of St. Basil,[32] St. Gregory of Nazianzus,[33] St. Gregory of Nyssa,[34] Asterius of Amasea [35] and St. Nilus,[36] for the East; for the West, those of St. Jerome,[37] St. Augustine,[38] Prudentius,[39] and St. Paulinus of Nola.[40]

Mention of *veneration* paid to those same images is, however, far less frequent. When pointing out expressly the instruction of the ignorant and the edification of the spec-

[29] *Graecar. affection. curatio,* VI; *De provid. Dei* (*P. G.,* LXXXIII, 989).

[30] "Vexillumque crucis summus dominator adorat" (*Apotheos.,* about 448, *P. L.,* LIX, 960).

[31] *P. L.,* XXVI, 1124.

[32] *Homilia* XVII *in Barlaam martyrem,* 3 (*P. G.,* XXXI, 489).

[33] *Carmen,* X, Περὶ ἀρετῆς, *P. G.,* XXXVII, 737, 738.

[34] *Oratio laudat. sancti Theodori, P. G.,* XLVI, 737.

[35] *In laudem sanctae Euphemiae* (*P. G.,* XL, 333–337). The whole discourse is but a description of the paintings of the *velum* that adorned the Saint's oratory.

[36] *Epist.* IV, 61. He gives to his correspondent a plan of ornamentation and painting for a church.

[37] *In Ionam,* IV, vers. 6 (*P. L.,* XXV, 1147, 1148).

[38] *De consensu evangelist.,* I, 16 (*P. L.,* XXXIV, 1049); *Contra Faustum,* XXII, 73 (*P. L.,* XLII, 446).

[39] *Peristephanon,* hymn. IX, vers. 7 and foll.; XI (*P. L.,* LX, 433–435, 530 and foll.).

[40] *Poema* XXVII; XXVIII; *Epist.* XXXII (*P. L.,* LXI, 660 and foll.; 663 and foll.; 330 and foll.).

tators as the aim of religious paintings, St. Gregory of Nyssa and St. Nilus seem almost to exclude veneration. However, St. Gregory of Nazianzus, when he speaks of the image of the holy man Polemo, the sight of which sufficed to convert a sinful woman, calls that image "venerable," *καὶ γὰρ ἦν σεβασμία.* Theodoret relates that the name and deeds of St. Simeon Stylites were so well known that, even at Rome, small statues of him were placed in the vestibules of houses, as a help and protection for those who dwelt therein, *φυλακήν τινα σφίσιν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀσφάλειαν ἐντεῦθεν πορίζοντας.*[41] Sentiments of religious confidence like these are evidently closely akin to veneration.

We may say, then, that, during the 4th and 5th centuries, the *use* of images is universal, while their *veneration,* more expressly as regards images of the cross, begins to appear. From the fact that Vigilantius, who is strongly opposed to the veneration of relics, says nothing against that of images, it is safe to infer that, in his time, *viz.,* about the year 400, the latter had very little prominence.

In some quarters the veneration, nay the very use of images, was looked upon with suspicion or even formally opposed. Some continued to think that the prohibition expressed in *Exodus* was still binding on Christians; others were struck by the similarity between the veneration of images and idolatry, and feared lest one might lead to the other. In fact, when taunted by Christians for adoring wood or stone, the heathen were wont to answer that, for them, the material idol was but an image that reminded them of the invisible deity to whom their homages were paid: "Nec simulacrum nec daemonium colo, sed effigiem corporalem eius rei signum intueor quam colere debeo."[42]

Christian controversialists, of course, were unwilling to

[41] *Historia religiosa,* XXVI (*P. G.,* LXXXII, 1473).

[42] *Ap.* Augustin., *Enarratio in psalm.* CXIII, sermo II, 4 (*P. L.,*

accept that distinction. No one could claim that ordinary pagans understood idol-worship thus. Anyhow, they showed that it was very easy to pass from the philosophical view of an idol to its materialistic worship, and that, as a matter of fact, most people did not avoid this danger. But in so doing, those controversialists advanced of necessity a certain number of considerations that told, not only against pagan idol-worship, but also against the Christian image-veneration: "Ducit enim, et affectu quodam infimo rapit infirma corda mortalium formae similitudo et membrorum imitata compago. . . . Quis autem adorat vel orat intuens simulacrum qui non sic afficitur ut ab eo se exaudiri putet, ab eo sibi praestari quod desiderat speret?" [43] These remarks of St. Augustine have led some scholars to look upon him as an opponent of image-veneration. This is not the case, for, in the texts just quoted, the Saint has not in view that veneration; he speaks generally; the most that can be said is that from his words one can draw an argument against image-veneration.[44]

But a more direct and more radical opposition came from other quarters, particularly from the Council of Elvira, which was held in the year 305 or 306. Its 36th canon reads as follows: "*Placuit picturas in ecclesia esse non debere, ne quod colitur et adoratur in parietibus depingatur.*" [45] It has been asked what precise reasons dictated this canon, and

XXXVII, 1483); cf. 3; Macarius Magnes, Ἀποκριτικός, IV, 21 (edit. Blondel, p. 200; Pitra, *Spicil. solesm.*, I, 317, 318).

[43] St. Augustine, *Enarr. in psalm.*, CXIII, sermo II, 1, 5; cf. *Epist.* CII, 20.

[44] According to Mgr. Duchesne (*De Macario Magnete et scriptis eius*, Paris, 1877, p. 32–34), St. Augustine's sentiment is also that of Macarius Magnes in his Ἀποκριτικός. In matter of fact, Macarius does not think it lawful to represent the angels, who are spirits; but, whilst condemning idol-worship, he does not reprove the Christian veneration of images (edit. Blondel, p. 214, 215).

[45] Mansi, II, 11.

whether, in enacting it, the council was not prompted by some antipathy to images, or whether it was merely anxious to forestall possible abuses or profanations. The first hypothesis is more in accordance with the generally rigoristic tenor of its decisions and the text of the prohibition itself. The council will have no images in churches, because it sees in images a sort of opposition between the holiness and majesty of the mysteries of faith (*quod colitur et adoratur*) and the more or less emollient productions of human art. At any rate, the decree was confined to Spain, and, as we saw from Prudentius' case, was shortlived.

The opposition of Eusebius of Cæsarea was based rather on Scripture and theology. Eusebius had an opportunity of expressing his views on that subject in his reply to Constantine's sister, Constantia, who had asked him for an image of Christ.[46] Constantia, he writes, has asked for an image of Christ; but what image does she mean? Does she want an image of the Word who is in Jesus Christ? But the Father alone knows thoroughly what the Son is. Does she mean an image of His glorious humanity? But how represent by means of dull colors that humanity all transfigured and immersed in the divine light? Perhaps she means an image of the humanity before the resurrection and ascension: but, then, is Constantia unacquainted with the biblical prescription to make no image of what is upon earth or in heaven? Hence, he will not grant her request; and in order to justify his refusal, the Bishop of Cæsarea adds that he once met a woman who held in her hands images which she thought represented our Lord and St. Paul, and that he took them away from her, lest such a practice might

[46] Pitra, *Spicil. solesm.*, I, 383–386. Eusebius shows the same sentiment in his *Ecclesiastical History,* VII, 18, where he accounts for the erection of the statue of Jesus Christ at Paneas by a survival of pagan prejudices.

spread among the people, and, like the heathen, some might seem to carry God in a painting.

I have given a detailed analysis of Eusebius' letter, because the reasons he adduces against the possibility of representing the glorified Savior were later used as a sort of commonplace topic by the Iconoclasts against their opponents.[47]

§ 2. Use and Veneration of Images During the Sixth and Seventh Centuries.

In spite of the protestations just mentioned, the *use* of images was almost general in the Church at the end of the 5th century. The practice became still more extensive in the following ages; and as this is a well known fact, I need not prove it.

The *veneration* of images, although less apparent, grows also and is even theoretically inculcated and justified during

[47] Many scholars have pointed out for the 4th century, besides the opposition of the Council of Elvira and of Eusebius, that of St. Epiphanius. In fact, a letter which he sent to John of Jerusalem, about the year 394, and of which only a Latin translation, made by St. Jerome, is extant (*P. G.*, XLIII, 390; *P. L.*, XXII, 526), contains, n. 9, the narrative of a rather interesting occurrence. St. Epiphanius relates that once he entered a church and found there a veil that bore the image of Jesus Christ or a saint. "Cum ergo hoc vidissem," he goes on to say, "et detestatus essem in ecclesia Christi, contra auctoritatem Scripturarum, hominis pendere imaginem, scidi illud." After tearing the veil, he suggested to the keepers of the place to use the veil as a winding-sheet for a corpse; and now, he sends to his correspondent another veil to replace that which had been torn, but with this addition: "Et precor ut iubeas presbytero eiusdem loci accipere velum a lectore quod a nobis missum est, et deinceps praecipere in ecclesia Christi istiusmodi vela quae contra religionem nostram veniunt non appendi. Decet enim honestatem tuam hanc magis habere sollicitudinem ut scrupulositatem tollat, quae indigna est ecclesia Christi et populis qui tibi crediti sunt." It seemed hardly probable that St. Epiphanius, who traveled so extensively, had never before noticed the growth of Christian art at the end of the 4th century. A discovery made by M. D. Serruys has rendered the authenticity of the above-

the 6th and 7th centuries: "Adoramus omnem crucem," writes the deacon Rusticus, who played a part in the episode of the Three Chapters, "et per ipsam illum cuius est crux; non tamen crucem coadorare dicimur Christo, nec per hoc una est crucis et Christi natura." [48] About the year 593, Evagrius relates a miracle that took place at Apamea whilst the cross was publicly exposed and adored; [49] and one of the reproaches made to the Paulicians was that they did not adore the cross.

Moreover, we notice in the East, at that time, the growth of the belief that some images of Jesus Christ and of the Blessed Virgin are ἀχειροποιηταί, *i.e.*, not made by human hands, but of miraculous origin. The story of the image of our Lord, which He himself sent to Abgar, king of Edessa, is related at the end of the 4th or the beginning of the 5th century by the Syriac *Doctrine of Addai.*[50] Evagrius tells of the subsequent history of that image, and says

quoted passage from Epiphanius' letter extremely doubtful. The passage is found in Greek in an unpublished work of the patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople against the Iconoclast council of 815 (cf. below, p. 455). A comparison between the Greek text and the Latin translation makes it evident that the latter, which is very loose and free, cannot be ascribed to St. Jerome; and that the fragment, which has, in the Greek text, a special introduction, was added subsequently to the letter of the Bishop of Constantia. How account for its origin? Nicephorus gives us the answer, when he tells us that it first appeared in an Iconoclast selection of patristic texts — some authentic, others apocryphal — that were directed against holy pictures. M. Serruys does not hesitate to declare that particular text to be a forgery (*Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres,* 1904, p. 360–363). At the 7th general Council, another fragment of St. Epiphanius, forbidding the use of images in churches and cemeteries, was quoted; but the Council rejected it as apocryphal (Mansi, XIII, 292 and foll.).

[48] *Contra acephalos disput.* (*P. L.*, LXVII, 1218).

[49] *Hist. eccles.*, IV, 26 (*P. G.*, LXXXVI, 2, col. 2745).

[50] Edit. Phillips, text, p. 4, 5; transl., p. 5. Cf. my thesis, *Les origines de l'Eglise d'Edesse et la légende d'Abgar,* Paris, 1888; and E. Von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder,* Leipzig, 1899.

that, because of it, the city of Edessa was saved from the attacks of Chosroes.[51] St. Veronica's veil is first attested in the *Mors Pilati,* of which the earliest redaction dates back to the middle of the 4th century.[52] Zachary of Mitylene (about the year 562) speaks of similar images and of temples built to shelter them.[53] Such narratives could not but give a new impetus to the veneration paid to images, and, as a matter of fact, we see it growing more and more explicit. In its fifth session, the Seventh General Council quotes a letter from St. Simeon Stylites the Younger (+ 596) to the Emperor Justin, wherein he entreats the latter to punish some brigands who have profaned the images of the Son of God and of His holy Mother in a church; in Simeon's eyes, that is a most abominable deed.[54] In another passage, quoted by St. John Damascene,[55] the same author repels the charge of idolatry, brought against Christians because they honor images (*προσκυνοῦντες*). In an account of a conference held in 656 by St. Maximus Confessor with Theodosius, bishop of Cæsarea, we read that Theodosius, Maximus, and those who were present fell on their knees and kissed the gospels, the venerable cross, and the image of our Lord and His Mother.[56]

[51] *Hist. eccles.,* IV, 27.

[52] Tischendorf, *Evangelia apocrypha,* 1st edit., p. 432 and foll.

[53] Cf. *Les origines de l'Eglise d'Edesse,* p. 121, 122.

[54] Mansi, XIII, 160, 161; *P. G.,* LXXXVI, 2, col. 3216–3220.

[55] *P. G.,* LXXXVI, 2, col. 3220; cf. XCIV, 1409–1412.

[56] *P. G.,* XC, 156; cf. 164. In a discourse quoted by the second Council of Nicæa, John of Thessalonica, who attended the Council of 680 as the Pope's vicar, upholds the right to paint the images of the saints, not that the images themselves are adored (*προσκυνοῦντες οὐ τὰς εἰκόνας*), but the saints are honored whose features they reproduce (*ἀλλὰ τοὺς διὰ τῆς γραφῆς δηλουμένους δοξάζομεν*). He claims the same right for the images of Jesus Christ, who was visible; but he does not think it possible to have images of the Word and the Trinity; for under what form can they be represented? As to the angels, John goes on to say, one can make pictures of them, for they are not

The most complete and explicit testimony of that epoch on the veneration of images is that which the second Council of Nicæa drew from the fifth apologetical discourse delivered against the Jews by Leontius, bishop of Neapolis, in Cyprus, under the Emperor Mauritius (582–602).[57] It was no longer the Christians who reproached the heathen with their idol-worship; it was the Jews who charged the Christians with idolatry, for venerating religious images and the cross. What does Leontius answer? He does not deny the fact; he grants that the Christians adore the cross, venerate images, prostrate themselves before them, kiss them and place them in their churches; but he maintains that there is nothing idolatrous in all this because such worship is merely relative, paid primarily to the person represented or figured by the image, and not to the wood, stone and colors of the picture or statue:

"As long as the two boards of the cross are joined together, I adore the figure because of Christ, who was crucified thereon; as soon as they are disjoined, I throw them aside and burn them." [58]—"We, sons of Christians, when we adore the image of the cross, do not honor the substance of the wood; but, considering it as Christ's seal, stamp and signature, we hail and adore through it Him who was crucified upon it." [59]—"Thus, all of us Christians, when possessing and saluting bodily the image of Christ, or of an apostle or martyr, think in our minds that we possess Christ Himself or His martyr." [60]

absolutely spiritual, but possess a subtile and definite body, which is usually invisible, though it can be seen occasionally by some privileged friend of God. They are at times painted under a human form, because they showed themselves thus to those to whom they were sent (Mansi, XIII, 164, 165).

[57] Mansi, XIII, 44–53; *P. G.*, XCIII, 1597–1609.

[58] Mansi, col. 44; *P. G.*, 1597.

[59] Mansi, col. 45; *P. G.*, 1600.

[60] Mansi, col. 45; *P. G.*, 1600.

In every salutation and adoration we must consider not the exterior signs, but the underlying intention. The author goes on with his demonstration, borrowing his examples from Scripture, civil society, and the family circle, where we see special honors paid to the image, the seal, nay even the clothes of a person, and whatever belongs to him. Crosses and images are placed in churches, he continues, not because these objects are regarded as gods: it is *πρὸς ἀνάμνησιν καὶ τιμὴν, καὶ εὐπρέπειαν ἐκκλησιῶν.* Thus, Leontius concludes, "whoever fears God, therefore, honors, venerates, and adores Christ, our God, as Son of God, and also the representation of His cross and the images of His saints." [61]

The testimonies we have adduced come from the East and refer mainly to the East. The West also accepted the veneration of images, although it probably observed more coldness and reserve in its manifestations than the East. We have already noted the assertions of the deacon Rusticus regarding the adoration of the cross. In his poem on St. Martin, written before the month of May, 576, Fortunatus speaks of the Saint's picture before which a lamp was constantly burning. He says that he himself had been cured of an affection of the eyes by oil taken from that lamp:

> Hic paries retinet sancti sub imagine formam,
> Amplectenda ipso dulci pictura colore.
> Sub pedibus iusti paries habet arte fenestram:
> Lychnus adest, cuius vitrea natat ignis in urna.[62]

The testimony of Pope St. Gregory the Great deserves special study, the more so as he has been represented, if not

[61] Mansi, col. 53; *P. G.*, 1608, 1609. The quinisext Council of the year 692 treats of images in its 82d canon. Whilst calling them "venerable," it ordains that henceforth Jesus Christ be represented under His human form, and not under that of a lamb (Mansi, XI, 977–980).

[62] *De vita S. Martini,* lib. IV, vers. 690, 693 (*P. L.*, LXXXVIII, 426).

as an opponent of image-veneration, at least as one who had made up his mind to ignore it altogether. In the year 599, St. Gregory writes to Januarius, bishop of Caralis, concerning a Jewish synagogue which had been seized by the Christians and in which they had placed a cross and a picture of the Blessed Virgin. The Pope commands the bishop to remove the image and the cross from the synagogue with becoming honor and to restore the building to the Jews: "ut, sublata exinde cum ea qua dignum est veneratione imagine atque cruce, debeatis quod violenter ablatum est reformare." [63] It is, then, with religious respect (*cum veneratione*) that St. Gregory asks that both the image and the cross should be treated. In the year 600, St. Gregory wrote another letter on the subject. Under the impulse of an excessive zeal, and fearing lest his people might fall into idolatry, Serenus, bishop of Marseilles, had broken the images that were in his church. St. Gregory blames him for this action. Antiquity has accepted images, not indeed as an object of adoration, but as a means of instruction for the ignorant, who are thus taught what they must adore and

[63] *Epist.* IX, 6, col. 944. A more explicit text of St. Gregory on the subject is found in *Epist.* IX, 52, where the Pope tells Secundinus that he is sending him certain pictures for which he had asked, *viz.*, a cross, and some images of our Lord, the Blessed Virgin and the Apostles Peter and Paul. He goes on to say: "Scio quidem quod imaginem Salvatoris nostri non ideo petis ut quasi deum colas, sed ob recordationem Filii Dei in eius amore recalescas cuius te imaginem videre desideras. Et nos quidem non quasi ante divinitatem ante illam prosternimur, sed illum adoramus quem per imaginem aut natum, aut passum, sed et in throno sedentem recordamur. Et dum nobis ipsa pictura quasi scriptura ad memoriam Filium Dei reducit, animum nostrum aut de resurrectione laetificat, aut de passione demulcet." It is but fair to observe that this testimony concerning images is found only in a few MSS. of St. Gregory's letter. "Pauci sunt qui habent," say the Benedictine editors. However, it was quoted by Pope Hadrian in his answer to Charlemagne's *reprehensiones* (about 795). Cf. below, p. 461–462.

how they must act. This is the only viewpoint considered by the Pope:

"Aliud est enim picturam adorare, aliud per picturae historiam quid sit adorandum addiscere. Nam quod legentibus scriptura hoc idiotis praestat pictura cernentibus, quia in ipsa etiam ignorantes vident quid sequi debeant, in ipsa legunt qui litteras nesciunt. Unde et praecipue gentibus pro lectione pictura est. . . . Frangi ergo non debuit quod non ad adorandum in ecclesiis, sed ad instruendas solummodo mentes fuit nescientium collocatum." [64]

To my mind, it is wrong to infer from these words that St. Gregory absolutely condemned any kind of veneration paid to images. The contrary is proved by the text of his letter to Januarius. Here the Pope does not speak of veneration, simply because, as he is dealing on the one hand with a population that has superstitious tendencies — Serenus thought he had discovered some idolatrous practices,— and on the other, with a bishop rather opposed to images, he thinks it best to suggest only those considerations which were acceptable to all and could not be abused. Special importance attaches to the words in which the Pope asserts that the iconoclastic zeal of Serenus is in opposition to the way of acting of the whole episcopate: "Dic, frater, a quo factum sacerdote aliquando auditum est quod fecisti? Si non aliud, vel illud te non debuit revocare ut, despectis aliis fratribus, solum te sanctum et esse crederes sapientem?"

Hence, at the beginning of the 8th century, when the iconoclast struggle broke out, both the veneration and the use of images were generally accepted. However, during the period from the 5th to the 7th century, besides the oppo-

[64] *Epist.* XI, 13, col. 1128.

sition, already noticed, of the Jews and the Paulicians,[65] there was another, on the part of the Monophysites.

Theophanes assures us in his *Chronicle*[66] that Philoxenus of Mabboug rejected the pictures of our Lord and the saints. His assertion is confirmed by the refutation of the iconoclast resolutions, that was read in the Seventh General Council,[67] and by a passage from the *Ecclesiastical History* of the Monophysite John, that was read in the 5th session of that Council.[68] Philoxenus did not think that one was honoring Christ by making images of Him, and he regarded it as illicit to represent in a bodily form the angels, who are spiritual beings, and as childish to represent the Holy Ghost under the shape of a dove; consequently, he tore down the pictures of the saints and hid those of Christ.

The same charges are made by the Seventh General Council against Severus, Peter the Fuller, and the Acephali generally.[69] For there was a great deal of affinity between Monophysitism and Iconoclasm. The reader may recall that, according to Eusebius of Cæsarea, the reason why Christ's glorified human nature cannot be represented is that

[65] The Paulicians were a branch of the Manicheans, who appeared in the second half of the 7th century, and whose history is fairly well known. Probably they rejected every kind of image; it is certain that they refused to adore the cross: Τὸν τύπον καὶ τὴν ἐνέργειαν καὶ δύναμιν τοῦ τιμίου καὶ ζωοποιοῦ σταυροῦ μὴ ἀποδέχεσθαι, says Peter of Sicily in his exposition of their doctrine (*Historia Manichaeorum*, 10; cf. 7, 29; *P. G.*, CIV, 1256, 1249, 1284).

[66] Ad ann. mundi 5982, col. 325.

[67] Sixth session, Mansi, XIII, 317.

[68] Mansi, XIII, 180, 181.

[69] Mansi, XIII, 317, 253. A letter written in the year 518, by the clergy of Antioch to John II, patriarch of Constantinople, and inserted in the official records of the Council of Constantinople of 536, charges Severus with stealing and keeping for his own use the gold and silver doves representing the Holy Ghost and hanging over several baptisteries and altars, under the pretext that the Holy Ghost must not be thus represented (Mansi, VIII, 1039).

His humanity is transformed, deified; it is ἄληπτος.[70] But for the strict Monophysites, *i.e.*, the Eutychians and those who held that there was in Christ a transformation or absorption of the humanity into the divinity, that reason evidently applied just as well to the human nature before the resurrection. For the moderate Monophysites, disciples of Severus, to trace the picture of Christ, meant to separate in Him the human from the divine element, to distinguish two natures, which was not allowed. One of the arguments adduced by the Iconoclasts to defend their view, was precisely the impossibility of separating in Jesus Christ what is limited and circumscribed from what is infinite and limitless. If one pretends to paint only the humanity, they said, he divides Christ; he is a Nestorian; he makes Christ ἀθέωτον; if one pretends to represent both natures at the same time, he confuses them and is a Eutychian; nay, he strives to confine within the limits of the body what cannot be circumscribed.[71] Monophysitism, then, quite naturally led to the rejection of images, at least of those of Christ; and we need not wonder that, as a matter of fact, its chief leaders held that proposition.

§ 3. The Iconoclast Heresy under Leo the Isaurian (726–740). Opposition of St. John Damascene.[72]

In the preceding pages we have noted the various manifestations of an opposition to the use and veneration of images. This opposition originated partly outside of and

[70] Pitra, *Spicil. solesm.*, I, 385.

[71] Mansi, XIII, 252, 256–260.

[72] Sources for the study of Iconoclasm: (1) First of all, the acts of the councils referring to that heresy, particularly those of the Seventh General Council (Mansi, XII and XIII) and of the Iconoclast Council of the year 815 (Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des conc.*, III, 2; English transl., vol. V). (2) The contemporary theological treatises on the subject: St. John Damascene's three discourses *Adversus eos*

partly within the Church. Outside, the Jews, and later on the Mussulmans and Paulicians charge the Christians with idolatry for using and venerating images.[73] Inside the Church, some bishops and theologians condemn the same practices either in the name of Scripture or because of considerations drawn from Christology, or again through fear of abuses.[74] Besides these particular reasons, there has been assigned, at least for some countries, a more extensive and deeper one, *viz.*, a secret aversion of the people of Syria and Egypt and of the Germanic tribes to the representation of human features in religious adornment. They mistrusted

qui sacras imagines abiiciunt (*P. G.*, XCIV, col. 1232–1420). The three treatises, *De sacris imaginibus adversus Constantinum Cabalinum* (*P. G.*, XCV, 309–344), *Epistula ad Theophilum imperatorem* (*ibid.*, 345–385), *Opusculum adversus iconoclastas* (*P. G.*, XCVI, 1348–1361) are not by St. John; the *Epistula* was written in 845; the *Opusculum*, in 771. Nicephorus, the patriarch, *Antirrhetica* (*P. G.*, C, 205–533). Theodore Studita, *Antirrhetici* (*P. G.*, XCIX) and his correspondence (*ibid.*). (3) From an historical point of view, the chronicles of Theophanes (*P. G.*, CVIII) and his continuators (Theophanes continuatus, *P. G.*, CIX); those of Leo the Grammarian (*P. G.*, CVIII), Nicephorus (*P. G.*, C) and George the Monk (*P. G.*, CX); the lives of the emperors and holy monks who took part in the discussion, given in *P. G.*, XCIX, C, CVIII, CXV.— The special sources for the Iconoclast controversy in the West will be given later.— Works: Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des conciles*, III, 2, Paris, 1910. (*History of the Councils*, vol. V, p. 260 and foll.). K. Schwarzlose, *Der Bilderstreit*, Gotha, 1890; Tougard, *La persécution iconoclaste*, Paris, 1897; E. Marin, *Les moines de Constantinople*, Paris, 1897; L. Bréhier, *La querelle des images*, Paris, 1904; J. Pargoire, *L'Eglise byzantine de 527 à 847*, Paris, 1905.

[73] Primitive Islamism was not opposed, in principle, to figured representations. It became so under the influence of the Syrian and Coptic populations in whose midst it was implanted. The proscription of images among the Mussulmans dates back only to Caliph Omar II (717–720). Cf. L. Bréhier, *op. cit.*, pp. 9–11.

[74] That such abuses occurred here and there, nay, that, whilst the controversy was going on, they grew worse in some places, and increased in number and assumed the form of a more energetic protest on the part of some of those who were exasperated by persecution, cannot reasonably be questioned. Instances will be given later.

the high esteem in which the Greeks held human beauty, as a kind of idolatry; and it was rather by means of geometrical lines, of twining and twisting repeated over and over again, and symbols borrowed either from plants or animals, that they strove to express the sense of the divine and infinite.[75]

All these influences seem to have worked more or less consciously upon the mind of Leo the Isaurian, and prompted him to declare war on images. Leo was born at Germanicia, in the very heart of Syria, and he may have been acquainted with the Paulicians, whose center of action, Samosata, was not far distant. He may have also been indirectly influenced by the Mussulmans and the Jews.[76] At all events, it is certain that, at a very early period, Leo was on friendly terms with a small group of bishops who were decidedly opposed to images. Their leaders were Constantine, bishop of Nacolia, Thomas, bishop of Claudiopolis, and Theodosius, archbishop of Ephesus (and son of the former Emperor Tiberius II), who was regarded as Leo's adviser.[77]

It was in the year 726 that Leo published his first edict against images.[78] Whilst we do not know its exact contents,[79] it certainly aimed at the destruction of images. But if the Emperor thought that his orders would be readily car-

[75] L. Bréhier, *op. cit.*, p. 8, 9.

[76] Theophanes expressly affirms this (*Chronicle,* ad ann. mundi 6215, col. 812); but his account of the renegade Beser is not altogether reliable.

[77] The first-mentioned two bishops are known from the letters of Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople (Mansi, XIII, 100, 105, 108). About Theodosius, cf. Mansi, XII, 967.

[78] Leo had ascended the imperial throne and thus become the founder of a new dynasty in the year 716. All historians agree in praising his military and administrative abilities. Unfortunately, like so many Byzantine emperors, he wanted to rule both Church and State. He was reported to have said, *βασιλεὺς καὶ ἱερεύς εἰμι* (Mansi, XII, 975).

[79] At all events,— notwithstanding what was said *supra* on the strength of a Latin translation of the life of St. Stephen the younger, Leo did

ried out, he was mistaken. At Constantinople, an officer who tried to overthrow the picture of Christ adorning the vestibule of the imperial palace, was killed. Greece and the Cyclades revolted and, after proclaiming a certain Cosmas emperor, fitted out a fleet, which sailed for Constantinople and was annihilated on April 18, 726. In Italy, the rebellion was almost universal. In the center and north-east, that were still subject to Byzantium, the imperial functionaries were expelled; the duchies of Venetia and Pentapolis seceded; the exarch was invested in Ravenna, and Campania could not be subdued.[80]

Our information regarding the ecclesiastical opposition to the new heresy in the East is rather scant. It seems that till the year 729 or 730, Leo the Isaurian did not exact doctrinal acceptance of his measures from the bishops. In 730, he tried to get the patriarch Germanus to subscribe to the condemnation of images. Germanus, who on several occasions had blamed Leo's conduct, refused his signature, handed in his resignation (January 7, 730), and died of strangulation a short time after. His successor, the *syncellus* Anastasius, yielded to Leo's demands, and several bishops were probably induced by his example to do likewise. Others, as we have seen, needed not his example, but sanctioned the Emperor's iconoclast views from the very beginning.

However, there was one bishop in the West who could not be reached as easily as the patriarch of Constantinople, though his assent was of the greatest import. The Emperor must have soon realized that he would never be able to obtain anything from the Pope. Although he had conferred

not merely command to place images higher in the churches. The same *Life* supposes that the Emperor made his will known directly and orally, in a popular assembly: this detail is not improbable: λόγον ποιεῖσθαι, says Theophanes.

[80] Cf. the *Liber pontificalis* (a contemporaneous account) I, 404, 405.

a signal benefit on Leo by helping him to retain his possessions in Italy, Gregory II (715–731) despised his promises as well as his threats and answered Anastasius' inthronization letter by a threat of excommunication, unless the Patriarch amended his ways.[81] He wrote also to the Emperor, in an attempt to bring him back to better sentiments. His letters (now no longer extant) [82] were fruitless. His successor, Gregory III (731–741), was just as firm and equally unsuccessful. Four times he strove to have letters in which he protested on behalf of persecuted orthodoxy delivered to the Emperor through the regular channels. These letters either were not handed to the Emperor or were intercepted on the way. As to a fifth attempt on the part of the Pope, we do not know its result.[83] The doctrinal attitude of the Pope was never in doubt. On November 1, 731, a council which he had gathered at the confession of St. Paul and which consisted of ninety-three members, decreed "ut si quis deinceps, antiquae consuetudinis apostolicae ecclesiae tenentes fidelem usum contemnens, adversus eandem venerationem sacrarum imaginum, videlicet Dei et domini nostri Iesu Christi et genetricis eius semper virginis immaculatae atque gloriosae Mariae, beatorum apostolorum et omnium sanctorum depositor atque destructor et profanator vel blasphemus extiterit, sit extorris a corpore et sanguine domini nostri Iesu Christi, vel totius ecclesiae unitate atque compage." [84]

Leo replied by fitting out a fleet that was to overcome the

[81] *Lib. pontif.*, I, 404, 409.

[82] The two letters published in MANSI (XII, 959 and 975), seem to have been forged at Constantinople by a contemporary. From this viewpoint, they have a certain documentary value (L. DUCHESNE, *Lib. pontif.*, I, 415, note 45).

[83] *Lib. pontif.*, I, 416, 417. The letters were addressed to Anastasius and the two Emperors, Leo and Constantine (Copronymus).

[84] *Lib. pontif.*, I, 416.

opposition of the Pope and the Italians; but it was wrecked in the Adriatic. Then the Emperor turned upon Sicily and Calabria; he burdened the inhabitants with taxes, confiscated the patrimony of the Roman Church, and placed the bishoprics of Southern Italy under the jurisdiction of Constantinople. These were the reprisals of an impotent wrath.

Meanwhile, in the East, a man of learning had raised his voice on behalf of images, even before Rome had spoken. This was St. John Damascene.

Of his three discourses on the subject of images,[85] the first dates back probably to the year 726, the second to about 730, and the third was composed a few years later. The ideas found in all three discourses are substantially the same. In several passages the style is almost identical. Each discourse ends with a series of patristic testimonies.[86]

The following is a doctrinal summary of the three discourses:

God is invisible, limitless, absolutely incorporeal. Hence He cannot be sensibly represented as He is, although He made Himself known to the prophets under purely intelligible images or species (I, 4; II, 7, 11; III, 4, 9, 24). But God became man, and as such He can be painted and represented: *οὐ τὴν ἀόρατον εἰκονίζω θεότητα, ἀλλ' εἰκονίζω θεοῦ τὴν ὁραθεῖσαν σάρκα* (I, 4, 16; III, 6). Likewise, the Blessed Virgin Mary, the saints, and in general all corporeal beings can

[85] *P. G.*, XCIV, 1232–1420. To this may be added what the Saint says on the same subject in the *De fide orthodoxa,* IV, 16, though it is but a tame summary of his discourses.

[86] Several of these testimonies are apocryphal. However remarkable the discourses are from a theoretical point of view, they bear the signs of a period of decadence. The sense of historical criticism is at times sorely lacking, and the author is apparently ready to accept whatever wonders and legends favor his views.

be represented (I, 19; III, 24). As to the angels, demons, and human souls, they too can be represented; for, although they are immaterial, compared with earthly bodies, compared with God, they are not absolutely simple, but are bodies (σώματα); finite, circumscribed, limited to one place, and revealed to us under images or figures (III, 25).—So much for the possibility of religious images.

But are we allowed to make and use them?

Some say no. They appeal to the Old Testament. But the prohibitions there enjoined were not as absolute as is claimed (I, 20; II, 9; III, 9); they have, moreover, been annulled, for we are no longer subject to the Old Law, but to Grace; we are no longer children, we have attained maturity in Christ (I, 6–8; II, 7, 8; III, 8). By making Himself visible, God Himself has prompted us to make His image visible (II, 5). Besides, the use and tradition of the Church allows images; and that tradition, even independently of the Bible, suffices (I, 23; II, 16). Are there not images in evidence everywhere? Is not God the author of a great many images? The Son is the Father's image (I, 9; III, 18); in God there is the image of what He will create (I, 10; III, 19); the world and man especially is the image of God, of the Trinity (I, 11; III, 20); the entire Old Testament is but a figure and image of the New (I, 12; III, 22); and what is history, what are the monuments of the past, but an image of that past? (I, 13; III, 23).

The *use* of images is then legitimate.

Is this also the case with the *veneration* paid to them?

Some object that images are matter, that they are created, and that worship is due to God only. This is true: images are material *per se;* they are created; but the question is whether or not created and material things can be objects of veneration and worship. Are not the body and blood of Jesus Christ material and created? And yet we

adore them. Are not the cross, the chalice, and other instruments of worship material? and yet we honor them. Let us not, then, speak evil of matter, nor hold Manichean views: *μὴ κάκιζε τὴν ὕλην· οὐ γὰρ ἄτιμος* (I, 16; II, 13, 14).

Besides, we must distinguish several kinds of worship. The worship paid to images is not absolute but relative,—it refers to the original. This is the fundamental principle proclaimed by St. Basil: *ἡ γὰρ τῆς εἰκόνος τιμὴ πρὸς τὸν πρωτότυπον διαβαίνει* (I, 21). Then divine adoration (*latria*) is one thing (*ἡ τῆς λατρείας προσκύνησις*), and reverence (*ἡ ἐκ τιμῆς προσαγομένη*) is another: the latter has for its object persons or things endowed with some special excellence or dignity (I, 8, 14). The word *προσκύνησις* expresses sentiments such as respect, love, reverential fear, submission, humiliation (III, 40). Now, adoration or latria is paid to God only; woe to him who would thus adore images! (I, 16; II, 11; III, 9, 40); but veneration, homage, the *προσκύνησις τιμητική* can and must be given to whatever is honored with some dignity (III, 40); homage is religious when it is paid to things or persons that are religiously excellent, such as the saints, relics, the instruments of worship, the Bible; and it is to that category that the images of our Lord and the saints belong (III, 33–36): it is civil, when it is paid to those who hold a prominent place in the social order, such as masters, princes, etc. (III, 37–39).

After concluding the essential part of his demonstration, St. John, in order to make his argument still more conclusive, recalls the many advantages connected with the use of images.

Images are a means of instruction; they are the book of the ignorant: *ὅπερ τοῖς γράμμασι μεμνημένοις ἡ βίβλος τοῦτο καὶ τοῖς ἀγραμμάτοις ἡ εἰκών* (I, 17).

They are memorials that remind us of the blessings of God and the mysteries of our Lord (I, 18).

They are powerful incentives to do good: the saintly examples, which they place under our eyes, prompt us to imitate them (I, 21).

Lastly, they are, to some extent, channels of divine grace. This is a conception peculiar to Greek theology: images are sacraments, as it were; they have received a sanctifying efficacy out of regard for the holy personages whom they represent: *Χάρις δίδοται θεία ταῖς ὕλαις διὰ τῆς εἰκονιζομένων προσηγορίας* (I, col. 1264; I, 16; II, 14).

These, then, are the main outlines of the defense of holy pictures as presented by St. John Damascene in the second quarter of the 8th century. As can be readily seen, he took a broad view of the subject under discussion and skilfully connected the question of the veneration and use of images with that of the part played by external rites and objects in the work of our salvation and sanctification, and with that of the possibility of matter being sanctified and raised to a supernatural state. This was solid ground, where no one could assail his position without attacking at the same time customs that had been held everywhere from time immemorial. Besides, and to conclude his exposition, he declared forcefully — and he, who lived outside the boundaries of the empire, could make that declaration more freely than many others — that it did not belong to the emperor to decide the question of the legitimacy of the use and worship of images, inasmuch as a secular prince has neither the authority nor the competence to do this: *Συνόδων ταῦτα οὐ βασιλέων* (I, col. 1281). *Οὐ βασιλέων ἐστὶ νομοθετεῖν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ . . . βασιλέων ἐστὶν ἡ πολιτικὴ εὐπραξία· ἡ δὲ ἐκκλησιαστικὴ κατάστασις ποιμένων καὶ διδασκάλων* (I, 12).

What a blessing it would have been had the Greeks recalled these principles to their minds more often.

§ 4. Constantine Copronymus and the Council of Hieria.

Leo the Isaurian died on June 18, 740. On the whole, his iconoclastic efforts had been rather tame, and, under his reign, only the provinces of Asia Minor, where the main strength of the iconoclast party lay, had seceded from orthodoxy. But his son and successor, Constantine V, surnamed Copronymus, had fully made up his mind to carry out his father's programme and to overcome all resistance. Owing to his fanaticism, the conflict assumed a character of atrocious severity: it seemed as though the worst days of heathen persecution were to return.

However, Copronymus was not at first able to carry out his designs, because of the rebellion of his brother-in-law, Artavasdes, who in 741 got temporary possession of Constantinople and reëstablished the veneration of images. Did this successful move of his brother-in-law make Constantine realize that he had better reckon with the sentiments of his subjects? This is not impossible; for, after reëntering the capital (November, 742) he maintained till the year 753 the relatively tolerant attitude to which his father had resigned himself. But in the year 753, he set out to accomplish his purpose.

He began by trying to obtain from the episcopate a doctrinal decision and anathemas on which the State could rest its decrees of repression. A council of 338 bishops met at the palace of Hieria and opened its sessions on February 10, 753. Although the patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria, as well as the Pope, were not represented, this assembly boldly called itself ecumenical. Theodore of Ephesus presided over its deliberations. The acts of this Council are no longer extant; but we have its ὅρος, or final decision, followed by several anathematisms, preserved in

the acts of the Seventh General Council.[87] The manufacture, use, and veneration of religious images are vigorously condemned, especially the painting of pictures of our Lord, the reason being that either the artist claims to represent all of Jesus Christ, man and God, and then he circumscribes the divinity and confounds the two natures; or he claims to represent the humanity only, and then he divides what must be united, he makes a body ἀθέωτον, he falls into Nestorianism, and those who venerate his handiwork are guilty of the same heresy.[88] The only image that the Saviour gave us of Himself, is the Eucharist, the consecrated bread and wine.[89] As to the images of the Blessed Virgin and the saints, they are forbidden by the Church, which rejects idols and idolatry.[90] Moreover, the saints are now living with God, and to attempt to prolong, as it were, their earthly life by means of images, is an impiety; while to represent their glorious persons by means of a vile material substance is to dishonor them.[91] There follows a series of biblical and patristic texts to support this reasoning. Then the Council decrees that any picture, either painted or of any other kind, must be ejected from the church as contrary to the faith and abominable;[92] and that, if any one is bold enough to make, venerate, expose or hide religious images in a church, or in his home, he shall be deposed, if he is a bishop, priest or deacon; and excommunicated, if he is a monk or layman.[93] However, there is an express prohibition against seizing upon sacred vessels and other sacred

[87] Sixth session (Mansi, XIII, 208–356). The text is printed in italics, and divided into sections, each of which is followed by a refutation.

[88] Mansi, *loc. cit.*, 252–260.

[89] *Ibid.*, 261–264.

[90] *Ibid.*, 273.

[91] *Ibid.*, 276, 277.

[92] *Ibid.*, 324.

[93] *Ibid.*, 328.

utensils under pretense of destroying the images adorning them.[94]

These provisions are followed by anathemas that merely reproduce under another form the doctrinal decisions of the Council. The last of these anathemas was launched against the former Patriarch Germanus, George of Cyprus, another supporter of images, and particularly against Mansur,— a name given to St. John Damascene. On the other hand, however, the reader will observe that the ninth, eleventh, and twelfth anathemas reflect sentiments that have nothing to do with the iconoclast tendency. The ninth defines the legitimacy of the invocation of Mary and the power of her intercession; the eleventh, the legitimacy of the invocation of the saints and the power of their intercession; the twelfth, the resurrection of the body and the eternity of the final punishment and reward. These definitions were deemed necessary by the Council against the Emperor's alarming tendencies. For Copronymus was bent not only on destroying images, but on abolishing the veneration of relics and the invocation of the Blessed Virgin and the saints. According to Theophanes, he even thought of denying Mary's divine maternity.[95] Servile though they were, the bishops assembled at Hieria did not follow the Emperor as far as that, nay, they even dared to embody in their anathemas an express disavowal of his errors.

But Constantine had at last the weapon that he had been so anxious to get, and immediately began to make use of it. Some churches were profaned; in others, the holy pictures were destroyed and replaced by painted sceneries or birds, so that the oratories began to look like orchards or aviaries.[96] At the same time, the Emperor required bishops, monks, and

[94] *Ibid.*, 329–332.
[95] *Chronogr.*, ad ann. mundi 6255, 6257 (col. 876, 877, 884).
[96] *Vita S. Steph. iunior.* (*P. G.*, C, 1120).

even ordinary laymen to subscribe to the decisions of his Council. He does not seem to have met with much opposition on the part of the secular clergy. But the monks offered energetic resistance, and several preferred to go into exile rather than submit.[97] Hence Copronymus came to hate the monks and everything that bore the monastic stamp. In 761, the era of the martyrs opened with the execution of Peter Calybites. The persecution became exceptionally severe and cruel after 765. John of Monagria, Paul of Crete, St. Stephen the Younger, and many others perished in the midst of tortures.[98] Constantinople and the provinces witnessed horrible scenes.[99] The unfortunate patriarch Constantine himself fell a victim to the despot's sanguinary rage; he was deposed, exiled, and later beheaded. A eunuch, Nicetas, was put in his place.[100]

When Constantine died, on September 14, 775, a reign of terror was prevailing all over the empire; but, for all that, orthodoxy was still far from being conquered. A Lateran synod, held in 769, under Stephen III, had again condemned the iconoclast heresy;[101] and even in the East, a council celebrated at Jerusalem in the year 767, and representing the three patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria, had taken the same doctrinal stand.[102] Now that Copronymus was gone, people soon began to hope for better days.

§ 5. First Restoration of Images. The Seventh General Council.

These hopes were justified by the character of the new Emperor, Leo IV, the Chazar, who, notwithstanding his

[97] *Ibid.*, col. 1117–1120.
[98] *Ibid.*, col. 1164, 1165, 1176, 1177.
[99] Theophanes, *Chronogr.*, col. 108, 881, 897, 900.
[100] *Ibid.*, col. 884, 888.
[101] Mansi, XII, 720–722; *Lib. pontif.*, I, 476, 477.
[102] Mansi, XII, 272; cf. Theophanes, *Chronogr.*, col. 873.

sympathy for Iconoclasm, delighted in surrounding himself with monks, and did not push the execution of the decrees of persecution issued by his predecessor. The new empress, Irene of Athens, was known to be secretly in favor of orthodoxy. When, after the death of Leo IV, September 8, 780, she assumed the reins of government, as the guardian of her young son, Constantine Porphyrogeneta, the work of restoration began.

The patriarch Paul atoned for the misstep he had made in binding himself under oath never to restore images, by voluntarily resigning his office. The imperial secretary, Tarasius, who was chosen to be his successor (December 25, 784), forthwith rejected the iconoclast decisions of Hieria[103] and asked that a general council be called. This was perfectly agreeable to Irene, and Pope Hadrian, to whom she wrote, raised no objections;[104] the Oriental patriarchs of Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria also gave their consent.[105] But the presence at Constantinople of the former body-guard of Copronymus, who ardently supported his ideas, constituted a real danger. A first meeting of the Council, which took place in a sort of tentative way on August 17, 786, in the church of the holy Apostles, was broken up by the threats of a furious soldiery. Irene apparently yielded and declared the dissolution of the Council. However, she was only temporizing. Under various pretexts, she sent the refractory soldiers away from Constantinople, had them disarmed and replaced by reliable troops. On September 24, 787, another council convened at

[103] *Inthronization letter* in MANSI, XII, 1119–1127; THEOPHANES, *Chronogr.*, col. 928.

[104] MANSI, XII, 984, 985, 1055–1072. Cf. the fragment of the Pope's answer preserved by Anastasius, where Hadrian protests against the rather hasty ordination of Tarasius and the title of ecumenical patriarch attributed to him.

[105] MANSI, XII, 1127–1135.

Nicæa, in Bithynia; this was the second held in that place, and the Seventh General Council.[106] It was attended by 330 to 337 members, and presided over by Tarasius. Two legates, the archpriest Peter and the abbot Peter, represented the Pope; the other patriarchates of the East were represented by two monks, John and Thomas, sent, not by the patriarchs themselves, who, being under the yoke of the Arabs, could not communicate directly with Constantinople,[107] but by the higher clergy (ἀρχιερεῖς) and the archimandrites of those countries.

The Council held eight sessions, of which two or three only are interesting from a dogmatic viewpoint. In the second,[108] the Pope's letters to Irene and Tarasius were read, and Tarasius declared his acceptance of what they taught on the subject of images. In the fourth (October 1, 787),[109] after several biblical and patristic passages favorable to images had been read, the fathers declared that they believed in the intercession of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the angels and saints, reverently kissed (ἀσπαζόμεθα) the images of the cross and the relics, received, saluted, embraced, according to the Church's tradition, and venerated with an homage of honor (τιμητικῶς προσκυνοῦμεν) the images of our Lord, the Blessed Virgin, the incorporeal angels, who, however, have now and then appeared in a human form, and the saints. The sixth session (October 5 or 6) [110] was devoted to the reading and refutation of the decree of the Council of Hieria of the year 753, and the seventh (October 13) [111] to the reading of a profession of faith, in which the fathers repeat the creed of Constantinople, declare their acceptance of the first six

[106] The acts in MANSI, XII, XIII.
[107] They had failed to receive the inthronization letter of Tarasius.
[108] MANSI, XII, 1051–1111.
[109] MANSI, XIII, 1–156.
[110] MANSI, XIII, 204–364.
[111] MANSI, XIII, 364–413.

general councils, define that not only the image of the cross, but also those of our Lord, His Mother, the angels and saints must be exposed,[112] that we may kiss them and pay to them an adoration of honor (*ἀσπασμὸν καὶ τιμητικὴν προσκύνησιν*), but not the strictly so called latreutical adoration, reserved to God (*οὐ μὴν τὴν κατὰ πίστιν ἡμῶν ἀληθινὴν λατρείαν*); and, lastly, that we may burn incense and light candles in their honor, as is done for the cross and the gospels; for the honor paid to the image is referred to the original.[113]

All the members of the assembly subscribed to this profession of faith. Irene and her son signed it in the eighth and last session (October 23), which was held in the palace of the Magnaura of Constantinople. Besides, measures were taken for the destruction of the iconoclast writings.[114] The restoration of images was now an accomplished fact.

§ 6. Iconoclast Reaction, Followed by the Final Triumph of Orthodoxy.

Irene does not seem to have found it difficult to get the decisions of the Council accepted. However, the Iconoclast party still counted many followers, and the dissensions that existed between the Patriarch and the monks of Studion could but encourage their hope of again gaining the upper hand. With that purpose in view, the Iconoclasts made an unsuccessful attempt under Michael Rhangabe (811–813);[115] but in July, 813, a military revolution brought into power the Armenian general, Leo V. With him, the opponents of images were again triumphant.

Leo V had the imperial reader, John Hylilas, compose a

[112] The reader will notice that no allusion is made to God the Father.
[113] MANSI, XIII, 377.
[114] Canon 9, MANSI, XIII, 430.
[115] THEOPHANES, *Chronogr.*, ad ann. mundi 6304.

selection of biblical and patristic passages opposed to sacred pictures, and tried to win over to his views the patriarch Nicephorus, author of the *Antirrhetica.*[116] Nicephorus resisted; he even refused to discuss the subject with the Emperor's theologians, and, in an assembly of two hundred and seventy bishops and abbots who met at St. Sophia, reaffirmed the decisions of the year 787 and condemned Antony, the Iconoclast bishop of Sylæum.[117] Leo apparently yielded; but in the year 815 he again tried to carry out his plans. Nicephorus was exiled and replaced by a relative of Copronymus, Theodore Cassiterra (April 1, 815), with whom Theodore Studita declined to have communion. A council gathered at Constantinople and held three sessions. Its decisions have been found in an unpublished work of Nicephorus.[118] This Council annulled the proceedings of Nicæa and confirmed the decrees and canons of the synod of 753. However, it refrained from calling images idols, " for even between evil and evil distinctions must be made."

Now the destruction of images and the persecution of the orthodox believers were resumed. The measures adopted, however, were not so severe as those taken under Copronymus, for no one suffered death for his faith. But many bishops and monks were maltreated and exiled,[119]

[116] *P. G.*, C, 205–533; Pitra, *Spicileg. solesm.*, I, 302 and foll. This is perhaps the strongest and most popular work ever written on the question of images.

[117] *Vita Leonis armeni, P. G.*, CVIII, 1028, 1029.

[118] Cf. D. Serruys, *Les actes du concile iconoclaste de l'an* 815, in the *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire,* vol. XXIII, 1903. D. Leclercq gives a part of that memoir and the text of the decisions of the Council, in Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des conciles,* III, 2, p. 1217 and foll.

[119] *S. Nicephori vita,* XII, 73 and foll., 79; Mansi, XIV, 139–142; *Vita Leonis,* col. 1035. The organization of the orthodox party and the resistance of the monks of Studion made the Emperor realize that it would be a dangerous policy to drive them to extremities.

among them Theodore Studita and the chronicler Theophanes.

Under Leo's successor, Michael the Stammerer (820–829), the storm seemed to abate somewhat, and several exiles were able to return home, at least for a while. Although he declared that he had no intention whatever to abate the measures taken by his predecessors, Michael made several attempts to bring about a re-union. In 821 he called a council where orthodox and Iconoclasts might sit together and consult as to the best means of securing peace. Under the leadership of Theodore Studita, the orthodox refused to take part in a procedure that made no discrimination between them and their opponents, referred the Emperor to the see of Rome, "the highest of the churches of God, of which Peter, to whom the Lord said: *Thou art Peter,* etc., was the first bishop." [120] Michael then turned to the West and endeavored to win over to his cause Pope Pascal I and Louis le Débonnaire. His letter to Louis, which is still extant,[121] deserves consideration. The Emperor does not reprove the *use* of holy pictures in churches, which are designed to instruct (*ut ipsa pictura pro scriptura habeatur*); but he reproves their *veneration;* because, he says, that veneration, unlawful in itself, has degenerated into childish practices and ridiculous superstitions, so that measures were taken at Constantinople to suppress it.[122] The images that had been placed too low, had been removed; those which were higher, had been left alone, but on condition that they were not to be honored.

Evidently, the Emperor expected that this moderate pres-

[120] Mansi, XIV, 400, 401. [121] Mansi, XIV, 417–422.

[122] As has been said before, the existence of some abuses in the veneration of images cannot be denied; that such abuses really existed, could be confirmed, if needed, by the testimony of Theodore Studita himself, who approves the *spatharius* John for giving the image of St. Demetrius as a godfather to his son (*P. G.,* XCIX, 961, 964).

entation of the Iconoclast doctrine would win over Louis le Débonnaire. We shall see later that he succeeded. But his successor Theophilus (829–842) adopted a stricter theory and more severe measures. The prisons were again filled with refractory bishops and monks, and the painters of images were unmercifully scourged, beaten and mutilated. This was, as it were, the last effort of the dying error.

Theophilus died in 842, leaving a three-year-old son and entrusting the regency to his wife, Theodora. Theodora, like Irene, was orthodox. Her entourage were tired of struggling against a sentiment that became more and more an indispensable element of Greek piety. Hence the second restoration of images took place without difficulty. The patriarch John Hylilas brought about his own resignation,[123] and was replaced by the learned Methodius, who had suffered for the faith under Theophilus. A synod which met in the year 842, confirmed the decrees of Nicæa. The iconoclast bishops were not the last to declare their perfect acceptance of the sentiments of the court.[124] A special feast was established and placed on the first Sunday in Lent, to commemorate the triumph of orthodoxy.[125] It is still kept by the Greek Church,[126] which on each recurring anniversary anathematizes anew not only the Iconoclasts, but also, successively, all heretics.

Thus, after a struggle lasting nearly a hundred and twenty years (from 726 to 842), holy pictures were restored to their pristine rank of honor, nay to a higher rank than before. This was due to the fact that the opposition to them had not come from the peculiar genius of the Greek mind, of which

[123] Theoph. Contin., IV, *Michael*, 3, col. 165.
[124] Mansi, XIV, 787, 788.
[125] Theoph. Contin., IV, *Michael*, 6, col. 168, 169.
[126] See N. Nilles, *Kalendarium manuale utriusque Ecclesiae*, 2d edit., 1897, II, p. 101 and foll.

Byzantium remained after all the heir, but from a sort of provincial spirit, of which the Isaurian or Armenian emperors had made themselves the spokesmen and agents. The Church rejected those foreign influences which tend to ruin both Christian art and doctrine, and, in her system of worship, faithfully preserved that share which lawfully belongs to the external and sensible representation of the supernatural.

§ 7. The Image Controversy in the West.[127]

Whilst the Iconoclast heresy was thus disturbing the East, the question of images gave rise to difficulties also in the West, particularly in France.

As we have seen, the Popes took a definite stand at the very beginning of the quarrel, and two Roman councils — held in 731 and 769 — had condemned the pretensions of Leo the Isaurian and Copronymus. In France, according to Eginhard,[128] the subject of images was dealt with in a council held at Gentilly, in 769; but we know nothing of its decrees. It is only after the Council of Nicæa that the attitude of Charlemagne and his bishops becomes definite. Pope Hadrian had a Latin translation of the acts of the Council of 787 made and sent to the king about the year 788. It was so clumsily literal, Anastasius the librarian remarks, that one could hardly read it and no one was willing to write it down.[129] It has been said that it was on account of this defect that the Franks opposed the doctrine of Nicæa. This is not quite correct. The Franks may indeed have been mis-

[127] The sources will be given as we go along.— Works: Besides the authors already quoted, cf. E. Bornet, *La controverse des images en Occident,* Lyon, 1906.

[128] *Annales,* DCCLXVII (*P. L.,* CIV, 385).

[129] *Praefatio in septimam synodum* (Mansi, XII, 981; *P. L.,* CXXIX, 195). Some fragments of this translation are found in the *Libri carolini.*

taken as to the significance of the προσκύνησις τιμητική (the word had been translated *adoratio*) which the Greeks paid to images; but it must be noted that, in France, not only adoration properly so called, but any kind of even relative worship, was denied to sacred pictures,— an error that could not at all be countenanced by the faulty translation that had been sent by the Pope to Charlemagne. When the translation was read to Charlemagne, he noted down many assertions that he disliked, and in the year 790 had a regular refutation of them drawn up, perhaps by Alcuin. These are the *Libri carolini.*[130] At that particular time, Charles was displeased both with Irene, by whom he had been deceived,[131] and with the Pope, who seemed to favor the Byzantine policy. Traces of his displeasure can be readily seen in the *Carolini.* Their criticism of what had been said and decided at Nicæa, is keen indeed, but often narrow, quibbling, and malicious. The work was probably officially presented in 794 to the Council of Frankfort, which, in its second canon, condemned the Council of Nicæa and the worship of images. But that was not all. Eighty-five *capitula* were taken from the *Libri carolini* and sent to the Pope, in the second half of the year 794, through the agency of the abbot Angilbert.[132] This is the *capitulare* spoken of by Hadrian in his answer to the King. The primitive text is no longer extant, but it can be reconstructed from the *reprehensiones* reproduced in the Pope's answer, and the *titles* that precede each chapter of the *Libri carolini.*

The doctrine propounded in the *Libri* is summarized in

[130] *P. L.,* XCVIII. Cf. J. Maréchal, *Les livres carolins,* Lyons, 1906.

[131] She had broken off the contemplated marriage of the young Constantine with Charlemagne's daughter Rothrude.

[132] *P. L.,* XCVIII, 1249. At least this is the order of events and the mutual relation of the writings, as presented by Petau and Hefele (2d edition). Other authors (Hefele, in his first edition) have looked upon the *capitulare* as the first writing, of which the *Libri carolini* were a mere development.

the preface of the first book, to which may be added the 21st chapter of the second and the 19th chapter of the third book. We may sum it up as follows: (1) God alone can be adored, and images must not be adored (II, 21).[133] (2) We must not pay to images the worship and veneration that we pay to the saints, their relics, the cross, nor even give them those expressions of respect which we give to persons who are still living and are far superior to those inanimate objects (III, 16, 24; II, 24, 28). (3) Nor can we admit for them even a relative worship. The principle that the worship paid to an image is referred to its original, is false; for Jesus Christ and the saints can not accept nor take for themselves a worship that is absurd in itself; and even granting that the learned can refer to the original the honors that they seem to pay to the image, " indoctis tamen quibusque scandalum generant, qui nihil aliud in his praeter id quod vident venerantur et adorant " (III, 16). (4) Hence we must not light candles nor burn incense before images that can neither see nor feel (IV, 3). (5) With the notion of worship set aside, we are free to paint and use pictures for the decoration of churches and in remembrance of past events; but even this is indifferent, and whether it is done or not, religion has nothing to gain or to lose, " cum ad peragenda nostrae salutis mysteria nullum penitus officium (imagines) habere noscantur " (II, 21). (6) However, where religious images exist, they must neither be broken nor destroyed (I, praef.; II, 23).

This teaching evidently went beyond a refusal to *adore* images. Every sort of even merely relative worship was denied them; they could only be *used*. The Council of Frankfort itself was more moderate, condemning only the

[133] The reader will observe that in the *Libri carolini* the word *adoratio*, used in the Latin translation of the acts of the Council of Nicæa, is always taken in its strict sense.

strict adoration of images and the Greek council which was believed to have approved of it.[134]

The Pope must have wondered at the unexpected opposition which Charles and his bishops raised to the decisions of Nicæa. However, Hadrian did not lose courage but answered point by point the *capitula* that had been handed to him.[135] His answers are often quite as subtle as the *reprehensiones* were flimsy. It is only towards the end that, coming to the main point at issue, Hadrian shows up the partial misunderstanding to which Charles had fallen a victim, and upholds the teaching of the Council of Nicæa and of his predecessors: "Et sicut de imaginibus sancti Gre-

[134] "Allata est in medium quaestio de nova graecorum synodo, quam de adorandis imaginibus Constantinopoli fecerunt, in qua scriptum habebatur ut qui imaginibus sanctorum, ita ut deificae trinitati servitium aut adorationem non impenderent, anathema iudicarentur. Qui supra sanctissimi patres nostri omnimodis adorationem et servitutem renuentes contempserunt, atque consentientes condemnaverunt" (MANSI, XIII, 909). This is all that we know for certain of the discussions and decisions of the Council of Frankfort on the subject of images. We see (1) that the Franks did not regard the council of Nicæa as ecumenical and that they thought it had been held at Constantinople,—this last error being explained by the fact that the last session had been held there; (2) they ascribed to it a teaching that was not its own;—an error occasioned by the poor translation they had under their eyes, and particularly by the misinterpretations of Constantine, bishop of Constantia on the island of Cyprus, who, in the third session, said: "I accept and kiss with respect the holy and venerable images; but I keep for the only and superessential and vivifying Trinity the adoration of latria" (MANSI, XII, 1147). The Latin translation of that passage read as follows: "Suscipio et amplector honorabiliter sanctas et venerandas imagines secundum servitium adorationis quod consubstantiali et vivificatrici Trinitati emitto; et qui sic non sentiunt neque glorificant a sancta catholica et apostolica Ecclesia segrego et anathemati submitto" (*Libri carol.*, III, 17, col. 1148). The error was flagrant, and it can be justly said that the canon of Frankfort rested on an *ignoratio elenchi.*

[135] MANSI, XIII, 759–810; *P. L.*, XCVIII, 1247–1292. The text swarms with errors. The Pope's answer must be placed between the end of the year 794 and December 25, 795, when Hadrian died.

gorii sensum[136] et nostrum continebatur: ita ipsi in eadem synodo definitionem confessi sunt, his osculum et honorabilem salutationem reddidere; nequaquam secundum fidem nostram veram culturam quae decet soli divinae naturae. . . . Et ideo ipsam suscepimus synodum."[137]

It is hardly probable that the Pope's answer modified the sentiments of the king and his advisers. They were imbued with a sort of inherited prejudice[138] which could not be overcome at once by reasoning, however stringent. At all events, no more is heard of the image question in France till the year 824, the time of the embassy and letter of Michael the Stammerer to Louis le Débonnaire, already referred to.[139] Michael's letter, which approved of the use of images, but not of their worship, tallied admirably with the ideas prevalent at the court of Louis; hence those who brought it were heartily welcome. The Emperor had them escorted to Rome and sent to Pope Eugene II (824–827) several memoirs on the subject of images. He also begged his permission to hold an episcopal meeting for the purpose of studying the question from the patristic standpoint. Eugene acceded to this request.

The assembly, which was made up of bishops and of some of Louis' courtiers, met at Paris in 825. It was not exactly a council, as was expressly declared by those who took part in it,[140] but a mere assembly which, however, as we shall see, attributed to itself exceptional importance.

The results of its deliberations were embodied in four documents that are still extant.[141]

[136] The Pope refers to the passage about images, in the letter of St. Gregory the Great to Secundinus. Cf. above, p. 436, n. 63.
[137] Mansi, XIII, 808; *P. L.*, XCVIII, 1291.
[138] Page 440.
[139] Page 456.
[140] Mansi, XIV, 463.
[141] Partly at least, for the end of some is missing.

The first is a lengthy memoir addressed to the Emperor and to his son Lothair.[142] Pope Hadrian's letter to Irene had been read, it says, and the Council had approved the Pope's condemnation of those who destroy images, whilst it had not approved his command to worship those same images. The Council of Nicæa had grossly erred, and the proofs it had alleged on behalf of the worship of images were absolutely inconclusive. As to Hadrian's reply to Charlemagne's *reprehensiones,* the Pope had answered " quae voluit, non tamen quae decuit "; in his writing there were " talia . . . quae remota pontificali auctoritate, et veritati et auctoritati refragantur "; and, had not the Pope, at the end, been held back by the teachings of St. Gregory, " in superstitionis praecipitium omnino labi potuisset." [143] From this prelude it is easy to judge of the sentiments of the assembly. The memoir went on exhorting the princes to approach the Greeks and the Pope with a view to bringing them back to the path of truth; it concluded with a series of patristic texts, directed either against the Iconoclasts or Iconolaters: the texts that would be the best suited to serve in the forthcoming negotiations were to be selected from this collection.

The second document that emanated from the meeting at Paris was the outline of a letter to be sent by the Emperor Louis to the Pope.[144] It contains only general remarks regarding the blessings of peace and the Roman primacy.

The third document was the skeleton of a letter to be sent by the Pope himself to Michael the Stammerer. This document embodied some fragments of a memoir of the Frankish bishops to Eugene II,[145] wherein was repeated, on the subject of images, the teaching of the *Libri carolini.*

[142] Mansi, XIV, 421–460; *P. L.,* XCVIII, 1299–1335.
[143] Mansi, *l. c.,* 422; *P. L., l. c.,* 1300, 1301.
[144] Mansi, XIV, 461–463.
[145] Mansi, XIV, 463–474. The fragments are given in columns 466–467.

Images, we read there, are something indifferent, concerning neither faith nor hope nor charity, and, therefore, must be neither imposed nor forbidden, neither honored nor destroyed. They are valuable only in as far as they adorn churches and instruct the people; it is illicit to worship them. Thus, the Paris assembly was not content with rejecting the Roman doctrine; it assumed to dictate to the Pope the letters he was to send to the East, as well as the arguments he was to employ for disowning the decisions of his predecessors and condemning a council that had been approved by them. Such simplicity and self-confidence can hardly be surpassed.

On December 6, 825, these various documents were handed to the Emperor, at whose request an extract from them was made, that was to be submitted to the Pope, together with a letter from Louis to Eugene.[146] We do not know what was the result of these proceedings. Probably nothing was done;[147] the Pope and the Franks upheld their respective doctrinal positions.

It is at this particular time that we must place the scandalous outburst of Claude, bishop of Turin.[148] Claude was a Spaniard, and, it seems, a former disciple of Felix of Urgel. After exercising for a while his priestly functions in the palace of Louis le Débonnaire, he had been promoted, about the year 817, to the bishopric of Turin. He himself says that he possessed but little learning; at all events, he shows himself one of those bold and narrow-minded logicians who do not shrink from any outlandish assertion that

[146] Mansi, XV, appendix, 435, 437; *P. L.*, CIV, 1316–1319.

[147] All that we know is that Halitgar, bishop of Cambrai, and Ansfried, abbot of Nonantula, were sent by Louis as ambassadors to Constantinople.

[148] About him, cf. the writers who opposed him, Jonas of Orleans and Dungal, whose works will be quoted presently, and the article of F. Vernet, *Claude de Turin*, in the *Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique*.

they believe is contained in their principles. On his arrival in his diocese, the new bishop found that the cross and images were venerated in his cathedral church, not perhaps without some abuses. He erased the images and tore down the crosses. He went even farther and protested against the veneration of relics and the intercession of the saints. These excesses revolted public opinion, and his former friend, Theodemir, abbot of the monastery of Psalmodia in the diocese of Nimes, rebuked the bishop in a letter that is no longer extant and seems to have been rather forcible. Claude's answer was a voluminous treatise, of which there remain but a few extracts [149] that give unmistakable signs of stubbornness and ill-breeding. His main principle is that God alone deserves to be worshiped, and no worship of any kind must be paid to any creature. Consequently, he raises a violent protest against the worship and even the use of pictures and of the cross — which he deems idolatry under another name (*non idola reliquerunt sed nomina mutaverunt*) — and strives to cover his opponents with ridicule. His writing did not remain unanswered. We have two answers, one from the pen of Dungal, a monk of St. Denys,[150] and the other from Jonas, bishop of Orleans.[151] This second answer, however, appeared only after the death of Claude (about the year 827) and that of Louis le

[149] *Apologeticum atque rescriptum Claudii episcopi adversus Theutmirum abbatem* (*P. L.*, CV, 459–464).

[150] *Liber adversus Claudium Turinensem* (*P. L.*, CV, 465–530). This work was published in the year 827.

[151] *De cultu imaginum libri tres* (*P. L.*, CVI, 305–388). The question has been raised, whether Claude found imitators in the West. The fact that Jonas found it opportune to publish his treatise fifteen years after Claude's death, makes this quite probable. We can here merely recall the treatise of Agobard of Lyons, *Liber de imaginibus sanctorum* (*P. L.*, CIV, 199–228), written about the year 825, and which, among some principles it has in common with the *Apologeticum* of Claude, maintains that God alone can be the object of worship. Whilst admitting the use of images, "causa historiae, ad recordandum," the author

Débonnaire (840). Both Dungal and Jonas admit in principle the doctrine of the Paris assembly of 825; but one can readily see that they have been frightened by the bold sentiments and expressions of Claude of Turin and have become thereby more guarded in their condemnation of the worship of images. Jonas carefully distinguishes several meanings of the word *worship,* and, following St. Augustine, shows that this word may be taken in a derivative sense which can certainly be applied to a creature.[152] He does not wish those who uphold the worship of images to be unceremoniously called idolaters, but regards them rather as ignoramuses who, charity demands, ought to be enlightened.[153] Dungal goes even further, and is willing to grant to " the holy pictures " some honor " in Deo et propter Deum." [154]

This determined, though somewhat softened, opposition to the worship of images endured in the Church of France till the end of the 9th century. In his *De rebus ecclesiasticis* (8), Walafrid Strabo (+ 849) seems not to deny to images some sort of worship: " Non sunt omnimodis honesti et moderati imaginum honores abiiciendi;" [155] but when we come to examine his attitude more closely, we see that these honors are negative, consisting merely in not despising, soiling, and destroying the images. The same attitude was probably taken by Hinkmar of Rheims (+ 882), in his work *Qualiter imagines Salvatoris nostri vel*

repeatedly condemns the practice of honoring them, and, on the whole, approves the Council of Elvira for proscribing paintings in churches, so as to abolish the abuse radically (col. 225, 226).

[152] Col. 319.

[153] Col. 315, 336.

[154] " Evidentissime patet picturas sanctas et Domini crucem et sacras electorum Dei reliquias dignis et congruis honoribus a catholicis et orthodoxis in Deo et propter Deum venerari oportere " (col. 527).

[155] *P. L.,* CXIV, 929.

sanctorum ipsius venerandae sint.[156] The work itself is lost, but we learn from Hinkmar,[157] that the Bishop of Rheims regarded the Seventh General Council as a pseudo-synod, whose members had not been able to give a sound solution to the question at issue.

It was only after the Eighth General Council — the fourth held at Constantinople (869) — had been received in France, *viz.*, at the end of the 9th or the beginning of the 10th century, that the orthodox doctrine on the subject of image worship was also received. For the Eighth General Council had confirmed the decisions of Nicæa, and no one could receive it without receiving also the decisions it had approved.

This long controversy, which was so much influenced by the particular genius of the various nations in whose midst it was carried on, thus came to a close. Image worship agreed wonderfully with the religious temperament of the Greeks, and it has always flourished in the Greek Church, as in its classical abode. In the West, Rome and Italy, the home of art, were the first to uphold it, although they never accepted some Byzantine conceptions according to which images were real sacramentals, and, as regards action and efficacy, were identified with the originals they represented. After a protracted opposition, France and Germany yielded at last to logic and, likely too, to the influence of Rome, and adopted image worship, though always bringing to its practice greater reserve and sobriety than the Greeks.[158]

[156] Flodoardus, *Hist. eccles. remensis,* III, 29 (*P. L.,* CXXXV, 260).

[157] *Opusculum LV capitulorum adversus Hincmar. Laudun.,* XX (*P. L.,* CXXVI, 360).

[158] As we study here only the history of dogmas, nothing is said of the influence of the Iconoclast controversy on art and on the status of the Byzantine domination in Italy. The reader will find some interesting remarks on these two subjects in the work, already referred to, of L. Bréhier, *La querelle des images,* chap. V–VII.

CHAPTER XI

THE THEOLOGY OF ST. JOHN DAMASCENE [1]

§ 1. Sources of Faith. The Trinity.

St. John Damascene — born towards the end of the 7th century, died about 749 — besides being the chief upholder of image worship against Leo the Isaurian, was the last of the great representatives of Greek theology during the early part of the Middle Ages. He gave the *Summa* and, as it were, the definitive formula of that theology, to which scarcely any addition has been made in the following ages. On that account, and also because, in his exposition of Christian teaching, St. John made extensive use of philosophic data, he has been compared to St. Thomas Aquinas. This is, however, doing him too much honor. As a matter of fact, he has neither the fecundity of the Latin Doctor nor his skill in unraveling the numerous and knotty problems raised by Scholasticism, then in its youthful vigor. During the 8th century, theological controversies had become rather scarce in the Greek Church, and, except for his controversial writings on images, St. John did not direct the minds of his contemporaries towards any new problems. He is chiefly a

[1] St. John Damascene is here quoted according to Migne's *Greek Patrology*, vols. XCIV–XCVI.— Studies: J. Langen, *Johannes von Damaskus*, Gotha, 1879; K. Holl, *Die Sacra parallela des Johannes Damascenus*, Leipzig, 1897. J. H. Lupton, *St. John of Damascus*, London, 1883. D. Ainslee, *John of Damascus*, 3d edit., London, 1903. V. Ermoni, *Saint Jean Damascène* (Pensée chrétienne), Paris, 1904. J. Bilz, *Die Trinitätslehre des hl. Johannes von Damaskus*, Paderborn, 1909.

compiler, who skillfully and methodically sums up the lengthy writings of his predecessors. It is but fair to observe, however, that as a compiler, he is exact, well informed, and forcible, and has thoroughly assimilated the teachings he reproduces. Those who came after him have merely reproduced him.

Damascene's most important work is *The Source of Knowledge,* Πηγὴ γνώσεως, divided into three parts, of which the last, *De fide orthodoxa,* is the principal.[2] The *De fide orthodoxa,* which is often presented as a work complete in itself, contains the whole theology of the author,— a theology of which some more important points are dealt with at greater length in separate treatises.

St. John extols the authority of Scripture (IV, 17),[3] and reproduces, according to St. Epiphanius, the canon of the Old Testament, with the exception of the books of *Wisdom* and *Ecclesiasticus.* His canon of the New Testament is the same as ours. Moreover, like St. Basil, he admits, as a rule of faith, besides Scripture, certain unwritten traditions that have come down from the Apostles, and certain ecclesiastical customs that must be accepted as authoritative: "He that believeth not according to the tradition of the Catholic Church . . . is an unbeliever."[4] As to philosophy, he values it so much and deems a knowledge of it so important for Catholic dogma, that he constantly introduces it in his doctrinal expositions, and devotes the first part of the *Source of Knowledge* to an explanation (under the heading *Capitula philosophica* or more briefly *Dialectica*) of the categories of Aristotle and the *quinque voces* or universals of Porphyry in

[2] *P. G.,* XCIV.

[3] Unless otherwise stated, all the references are to the *De fide orthodoxa.*

[4] Ὁ γὰρ μὴ κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῆς καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας πιστεύων . . . ἄπιστός ἐστιν (*De fide orth.,* IV, 10, col. 1128; cf. IV, 16; *De imagin., Or.* I, 23; II, 16).

the *Isagoge*.[5] However much he may depend on Aristotle, St. John, following in the footsteps of Leontius of Byzantium and St. Maximus, gives a goodly share of attention to Neo-Platonism. For the rest, he proclaims that, in matters of faith, we must listen not to philosophers, but to the Fathers,[6] and himself does not hesitate to give up and even to correct Aristotle whenever he seems to express views that cannot be reconciled with dogma. He leaves it to heretics to follow the Stagyrite blindly, as if he were "a thirteenth apostle," and to prefer an "idolater" to the inspired writers.[7]

The teaching of the treatise *De fide orthodoxa* about God is evidently copied from that of the Pseudo-Areopagite and St. Maximus. Of God we can know that He exists. His existence, of which we have, as it were, an innate knowledge, is proved by the changeableness of the created universe, the preservation and government of the world, the order and harmony of the cosmos (I, 3). But what God is *κατ' οὐσίαν καὶ φύσιν*, we can not understand or even know. When we speak of God's essence, we mean to say rather what He is not than what He is, for none of the positive attributes which we ascribe to Him, and of which the concepts are drawn from creatures, not even that of *being*, befits Him formally; not indeed because God does not exist, but because He is above whatever we may affirm of Him, above being as well as above everything else (I, 4).

From these high philosophical speculations, St. John comes down to the exposition of the Trinity, as conceived by Christians. Whilst he places what refers to God in general before what refers to the three divine persons,[8] he posits the Father

[5] Notice especially his words in *Fons scientiae*, prolog., col. 524; *Dialectica*, 3, col. 533.

[6] *Fons scientiae*, prolog., col. 525.

[7] *Contra Jacobitas*, 10 (col. 1441).

[8] I, 8, col. 808, 809.

as the principle of the divinity and the source of the other two persons: ὁ Πατὴρ πηγὴ καὶ αἰτία υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος.[9] On that account, and only because the Father is the Son's principle (κατὰ τὸ αἴτιον), the former is greater than the latter.[10] But the fact of being begotten or of proceeding does not imply in the Son, nor in the Holy Ghost respectively, an inferiority of nature.[11]

There are, then, in God three perfect persons, complete in themselves and subsistent, that are not parts of one substance, but all possess the whole divine substance. We must not say, then, that the divine substance is *from* three hypostases (ἐκ ὑποστάσεων), but *in* three hypostases (ἐν ὑποστάσεσι).[12] The holy Doctor remarks that, from the standpoint of the distinction of the hypostases, the comparison of the light that is produced by fire is inaccurate, because, if considered separated from fire, light, which is merely one of its properties, has no subsistence of its own.[13]

Persons in God are certain modes of subsisting (τρόποι τῆς ὑπάρξεως)[14] of the divine substance,— modes that are essentially opposed to one another and express the mutual relations of the persons constituted by them (δηλωτικὰ τῆς πρὸς ἄλληλα σχέσεως).[15] These three modes are: πατρότης, υἱότης, ἐκπόρευσις, or again ἀγεννησία, γέννησις, ἐκπόρευσις; they are the ὑποστατικαὶ ἰδιότητες.[16] In chapters 1, 6 and 7, St. John strives to give two kinds of rational explanation of the existence of the Word and the Holy Ghost in God. The first reproduces an old explanation, given by St. Dionysius of Alexandria; the second is rather weak.

However real the distinction of the divine Persons is,

[9] II, 12, col. 848, 849; I, 7, 8, especially col. 824.
[10] I, 8, col. 820.
[11] I, 8, col. 824, 825.
[12] I, 8, col. 824, 825.
[13] I, 8, col. 816.
[14] I, 8, col. 828.
[15] I, 10, col. 837.
[16] I, 8, col. 823, 828.

and however complete these Persons are, yet they have one and the same substance. The Damascene asserts very plainly indeed the numerical unity of the substance of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. In creatures, he remarks, individuals, although they have the same ideal and abstract nature, exist apart; their concrete being differs, and they can be counted as far as nature goes. In the Trinity, it is not so, because we find therein identity of substance (*ταυτὸν τῆς οὐσίας*), action, will, power, strength and goodness. "I do not say similarity (*ὁμοιότητα*), but identity (*ταυτότητα*)." Each of the Persons is one as much with the others as with Himself. The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are one in all respects, save those of not being begotten, of generation, and of procession." [17] The author goes even so far as to say that we can distinguish the three Persons only through the operation of our minds (*ἐπινοίᾳ*),[18] and some have regarded this expression as smacking of Sabellianism. In matter of fact, for St. John, that word (borrowed from the *Doctrina Patrum*),[19] far from excluding a real distinction between the three divine Persons, rather presupposes it.[20]

The unity of attributes and operations follows naturally from the unity of substance: *μία γὰρ οὐσία, μία ἀγαθότης, μία δύναμις, μία θέλησις, μία ἐνέργεια, μία ἐξουσία, μία καὶ ἡ αὐτὴ, οὐ τρεῖς ὅμοιαι ἀλλήλαις.*[21] Each of the Persons is *ἀγέννητος*, though not *ἀγέννητος*: all three are eternal and uncreated; the Son alone is begotten.

From the unity of substance there follows also what St. John calls, in a word borrowed from St. Gregory of Nazianzus, the *περιχώρησις* or *circumincessio:* "The three

[17] I, 8, col. 828.
[18] *Ibid.*
[19] Cap. 26, edit. Diekamp, p. 188–190.
[20] Cf. J. Bilz, *op. cit.*, p. 68 and foll.
[21] I, 8, col. 828.

Persons are inseparable and cannot part from one another, but keep to their separate courses within one another, without coalescing or mingling, but cleaving to each other." [22]

We shall not dwell at length on the teaching of the Damascene regarding the Father and the Son, because in this he merely reproduces and confirms that of his predecessors. What he says about the Holy Ghost deserves to be studied, inasmuch as the time is fast coming when Greeks and Latins are about to disagree on the subject of the *Filioque*. The Holy Spirit is God, consubstantial with the Father and the Son, equal to them in nature and dignity.[23] He proceeds from the Father and takes repose in the Son; He proceeds from the Father and is communicated by the Son; [24] He proceeds from the Father through the Son: ἐκ πατρὸς δι' υἱοῦ ἐκπορευομένη — δι' αὐτοῦ (λόγου) ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον — αὐτὸς (ὁ πατὴρ) διὰ λόγου προβολεὺς ἐκφαντορικοῦ πνεύματος — ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γὰρ, διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ λόγου προϊὸν, οὐχ υἱϊκῶς δέ.[25] Through the Son He is connected with the Father. He is the Spirit of the Son, the Spirit of Christ, the intelligence (νοῦς) of Christ, the Spirit of the Lord, the image of the Son as the Son is the image of the Father.[26] But St. John will not have us say that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son (ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ): "We speak of the Holy Spirit as from the Father (ἐκ τοῦ πατρός), and call Him the Spirit of the Father, and we do not speak of the Spirit as from the Son (ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ); but yet we call Him the Spirit of the Son." [27] "He is the Spirit of the Son, not as though proceeding from Him (ἐξ αὐτοῦ), but as proceeding from the Father through Him (δι' αὐτοῦ), for the Father alone is

[22] I, 14, col. 860.
[23] I, 8, col. 821.
[24] I, 8, col. 821, 833; cf. I, 7, 13, col. 805, 807.
[25] I, 12, col. 848, 849; *De hymno trisagio*, 28 (*P. G.*, XCV, 60).
[26] I, 13, col. 856; I, 12, col. 849; I, 8, col. 832.
[27] I, 8, col. 832.

principle" (*μόνος γὰρ αἴτιος ὁ πατήρ*).[28] Thus the holy Doctor clearly distinguished between being and proceeding *from* the Son (*ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ*) and proceeding *through* the Son (*δι' υἱοῦ*). He held that the Holy Ghost proceeds *through* the Son, but he denied that He proceeds *from* the Son. Does this mean that he ascribed to the Son no active part in the production of the Holy Ghost? By no means. In his mind, it cannot be said that the Holy Ghost proceeds *from* the Son, because the Son is not the principle of the Trinity; the Father alone is that principle, *μόνος γὰρ αἴτιος ὁ πατήρ*. Hence it is not with the Son, but with the Father, that the act that produces the Holy Ghost originally begins; however, it passes through the Son (*διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ*) as through an intermediary who, too, has become active by the strength of the Father, and therefore concurs with Him and under Him in the production of the term. Else, how explain the fact that St. John calls the Holy Ghost the Spirit of the Son and His image, if, in his opinion, the Holy Ghost proceeded in no way from the Son?[29]

In what the *ἐκπόρευσις* of the Holy Ghost properly consists, and how it differs from the generation of the Son, our author declares he does not know.[30] The word *ἐκπόρευσις*, which we translate by the generic word *procession*, was used by the Greeks exclusively to designate the special mode of origin of the Holy Ghost, and by itself affords no explanation of the process.

[28] I, 12, col. 849, and cf. *De hymno trisagio*, 28 (col. 60); *Homil. in sabb. sancto* (*P. G.*, XCVI, 605): *ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξ αὐτοῦ (υἱοῦ) ἔχον τὴν ὕπαρξιν.*

[29] Cf. the discussion of this point in J. Bilz, *op. cit.*, p. 156 and foll. The Son cannot be merely a medium (of time or place) through which the Father's action passes. The particle *διά* has a causative meaning. The reader may recall that Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret denied that the Holy Spirit received His existence *from* the Son or *through* the Son, *ἐξ υἱοῦ ἢ δι' υἱοῦ*.

[30] I, 8, col. 816, 820, 824.

§ 2. Angelology and Anthropology.

Each of the three divine Persons concurs, in His own way, in the work of creation. Creation is a work of goodness; it results from a simple act of the mind of God, who wills to communicate Himself (ἐννοῶν, II, 2). God is the author of all that exists. Against the Manichæans, St. John upholds the unity of principle, and declares that absolute evil would be simply nothing. In a being, relative evil is merely the absence or loss of some good; moral evil is the use of faculties, good in themselves, in a way that is out of harmony with the divine will.[31]

The Damascene treats of the angels in the IId book, 3, of the *De fide orthodoxa*. An angel may be defined as φύσις λογικὴ, νοερά τε καὶ αὐτεξούσιος, τρεπτὴ κατὰ γνώμην ἤτοι ἐθελότρεπτος.[32] That angels are absolutely spiritual, St. John seems to believe, for he says than an angel is φύσις ἀσώματος, οἷόν τι πνεῦμα καὶ πῦρ ἄϋλον; and if he adds that this is true only as regards us, for God alone is perfectly ἄϋλος and ἀσώματος, this restriction does not contradict his previous assertion.[33] The angels, who were created first, are free from bodily passions, though they are not altogether ἀπαθεῖς, — a quality which belongs only to God.[34] They are limited and finite (περιγραπτόι). They cannot be present everywhere, nor even in two places at the same time, but only where they go and act.[35] Likewise, they are not naturally (φύσει) immortal, but only by grace (χάριτι), for, as they began to exist, so they must one day cease to exist.[36] In the beginning they could sin, as they were not ἀκίνητοι, but merely

[31] II, 4; *Dialog. cont. manichaeos*, 14 (*P. G.*, XCIV, 1517–1521).
[32] Col. 868.
[33] Col. 866, 868.
[34] Col. 872, 873.
[35] Col. 869.
[36] Col. 868. Cf. *Dialog. cont. manich.*, 21, col. 1525.

δυσκίνητοι πρὸς τὸ κακόν: now the good angels have become ἀκίνητοι χάριτι.[37]

Have all angels the same substance, ἴσοι κατ' οὐσίαν? God alone knows, says the Damascene. It is certain that they differ τῷ φωτισμῷ καὶ τῇ στάσει; and here he presents the theory of the three orders and nine angelic choirs, as laid down by the Pseudo-Dionysius. The first order is made up of the seraphim, cherubim, and thrones; the second, of the dominations, virtues, and powers; the third, of the principalities, archangels, and angels. The lower orders are enlightened and taught by the higher.[38]

Such are the angels considered in their natural state. But we know that, immediately after being created by the Word, they were sanctified by the Holy Ghost.[39] Most of them persevered in grace, and as they are fixed immovably in what is good, they behold God and, as it were, feed on Him. These are the good angels. God's messengers and ministers, they fulfill his commands, appear at times to men, are set to guard some portions of the earth and some nations, are concerned with our welfare and lend us their assistance.[40]

Of the angels belonging to the last order, on the contrary, a great many have gone astray with Satan, their leader, and become evil through their own choice (II, 4). As they were incorporeal, they were unable to repent; their fall was for them what death is for man. Till they are consigned to the eternal fire that has been prepared for them, they strive to lead man astray and prompt him to sin; however, they cannot force his will nor foretell the future with certainty. God's power, on which they depend, holds in check the effects of their wickedness.[41]

[37] Col. 872.
[38] Col. 869–873.
[39] Col. 869.
[40] Col. 872.
[41] II, 4, col. 877; cf. II, 3, col. 868.

The treatise on the angels and demons is followed, in the *De fide orthodoxa,* by a series of chapters on the world and visible nature, as conceived by science at the time of St. John. Then he takes up the study of man, who is the synthesis of visible and invisible nature, a microcosmos in the great universe.

Created after the divine image, since he is intelligent and free, and after the divine likeness, since he must resemble God in virtue, man is made up of two elements, which were formed simultaneously in the beginning,— soul and body.[42] The soul is defined: *οὐσία ζῶσα, ἁπλῆ καὶ ἀσώματος . . . ἀθάνατος, λογικὴ τε καὶ νοερά.* Intelligence, the *νοῦς*, is not in the soul other than the soul itself; it is its most subtle part.[43] The whole soul is united to all parts of the body, and not part to part: it contains the body, rather than is contained by it,[44] and imparts to it the functions of the vegetative and sensitive life.[45] Of the origin of the soul St. John does not speak explicitly.

Man's primitive state was a state of bliss. Adam was adorned with divine grace; he lived with God and conversed with the angels, innocent, enjoying every felicity, and sure of the privilege of immortality, if he kept the law that had been laid down to him. His paradise was both spiritual and material — for his soul and his body.[46] However, God, who had foreseen his fall, had placed near him woman, in order that, through their union, mankind, having become mortal, might be propagated.[47]

Adam sinned, and, through his weakness, forfeited all the

[42] II, 12, col. 920, 921.
[43] II, 12, col. 924.
[44] I, 13, col. 853.
[45] II, 12, col. 924.
[46] II, 11, 30, col. 912, 913, 916, 917, 976, 977.
[47] II, 30, col. 976; cf. IV, 24, col. 1208.

gifts God had bestowed upon him. Deprived of grace,[48] he became subject to death and corruption, and to the miseries of this life; he experienced concupiscence and the tyranny of the body over the soul.[49] Through Adam, the same death and sufferings have entered into the world and passed to his descendants.[50] However, although St. John speaks of our inheriting from our first parents the miseries of life, which are the result of sin, he does not speak of a strictly so-called moral stain, transmitted to us together with life. In his commentary on the *Epistle to the Romans,* chapter V, he explains the ἐφ' ᾧ of verse 12 in the causative sense of δι' οὗ, and the ἁμαρτωλοί of verse 19 in the sense of "subject to death on account of sin." [51]

The fall has not, however, deprived man of his freedom (II, 25). In one passage, the Saint says that, left to ourselves, we can choose between right and wrong, although we are unable, without the divine help, to do what is right;[52] but elsewhere he states his thought with more accuracy: "Without God's coöperation and help we cannot will or do any good thing; but we have it in our power either to abide in virtue and follow God, who calls us into the ways of virtue, or to stray from the path of virtue." [53] Though St. John has not reflected much on the necessity of actual grace, he finds the exact formula when he comes to speak of it. Likewise, he speaks accurately — although superficially — of predestination. It is one thing, he says, to foresee, and another to define beforehand and predetermine; for in the latter case, there is added to the act of prevision an act of the will and a command. Now, only those events that do

[48] III, 1, col. 981.
[49] II, 30, col. 977.
[50] II, 28.
[51] *In epist. ad Roman.,* V, 12, 19 (*P. G.,* XCV, 477, 481).
[52] II, 29, col. 968.
[53] II, 30, col. 972, 973.

not depend on us are predetermined; those that do depend on us are only foreseen.[54] From this we may infer that St. John did not hold absolute predestination in the sense of St. Augustine. Moreover, he had already said, with a great deal of precision, that we must distinguish in God two kinds of will, an antecedent will of benevolence (*προηγούμενον θέλημα, καὶ εὐδοκία*), by which He wills the salvation of all men, and a consequent and permissive will (*ἑπόμενον θέλημα, καὶ παραχώρησις*), by which He wills that sinners should undergo either a remedial chastisement (*παραχώρησις οἰκονομική*) or a definitive and absolute punishment (*παραχώρησις ἀπογνωστική*).[55]

§ 3. Christology and Soteriology.

Jesus Christ is the remedy for sin. St. John Damascene devotes to Christology the whole third book and chapters 1–8 of the fourth book of his *De fide orthodoxa,* and besides, several controversial works, the *Contra iacobitas,*[56] the *De natura composita contra acephalos,*[57] the *Adversus Nestorianos,*[58] the *De duabus in Christo voluntatibus.*[59] But in order fully to grasp his thought, we must take into account the philosophical concepts by which he was guided and which, whilst found here and there in his works, are gathered together and summarized in the *Dialectics.*

The body of Jesus Christ was not formed in Mary's womb in a slow and progressive way. The organs and the

[54] II, 30, col. 969, 972; cf. *Dialog. contra manich.,* 72 and foll., 77, col. 1569 and foll., 1576 and foll.
[55] II, 29, col. 968, 969.
[56] *P. G.,* XCIV, 1436–1501.
[57] *P. G.,* XCV, 112–125.
[58] *P. G.,* XCV, 188–224.
[59] *P. G.,* XCV, 128–185.

whole body were from the very beginning perfectly shaped, though not fully developed.[60] At the same time that the body was formed, it was animated and united to the Word through the intermediary of the soul; there is no conceivable interval of time between these three actions: *ἅμα σὰρξ, ἅμα θεοῦ λόγου σὰρξ, ἅμα σὰρξ ἔμψυχος, λογική τε καὶ νοερά.*[61]

The human nature thus assumed by the Word, is not abstract humanity, considered *ψιλῇ θεωρίᾳ*, nor concrete humanity as it exists in men, in whom it is actually realized (for the Word was not united to each and every individual man), but it is an individual humanity, although it was an individual and a person only in the Word and through the Word.[62] However, since nature, as regards its constitutive elements, is wholly in all individuals of the same species, we can conclude in truth that the Word has been united to the whole human nature, and that in Him our nature has risen from the grave and ascended into heaven. This is why St. Paul says that God has raised us together with Jesus Christ, even though we have not been personally raised up from the dead. Moreover, we can conclude in truth that the whole divine nature has been united, in the Word and through Him, to the human nature, although the Word alone has become incarnate, and the Father and the Holy Ghost have been united to the humanity only *κατ' εὐδοκίαν καὶ βούλησιν.*[63]

That union of the Word with the humanity is *κατὰ σύνθεσιν*

[60] III, 2, col. 985; *De duab. volunt.*, 38, col. 177. In this last passage, St. John invokes the authority of St. Basil, *Oratio in Christi natalis diem.* Numbers 36 and 37 of the *De duabus volunt.* give rather interesting indications regarding what people thought of the Saviour's body.

[61] III, 2, col. 985, 988; 6, col. 1005; 12, col. 1032; *Contra iacob.*, 79, col. 1476.

[62] III, 11, col. 1024.

[63] III, 6, col. 1001–1008.

ἤγουν καθ' ὑπόστασιν,[64] and, in order to defend both the duality of natures and the unity of person in Jesus Christ against the Monophysites and the Nestorians, the Saint lays down the same definitions and philosophical theories as Leontius of Byzantium. An hypostasis is not quite the same as a concrete individual substance: "An hypostasis is a particular being subsisting apart by itself; it is a substance with its accidents, enjoying an existence of its own that is independent and separated from the other hypostases actually and as a matter of fact." [65] There is neither a nature that is ἀνυπόστατος, nor an hypostasis that is ἀνούσιος.[66] Every nature, then, is either ἐνυπόστατος or ἐνούσιος: or rather every nature is ἐνυπόστατος, just as every hypostasis is ἐνούσιος, since logically nature is never identical with hypostasis, and in reality but seldom. However, a nature may be ἐνυπόστατος in several ways: first, when it exists by itself and as an independent whole (καθ' ἑαυτήν), it is then by itself an hypostasis; second, when two natures exist and subsist reciprocally one in the other, and one with the other (σὺν ἑτέροις) and combine to form together one hypostasis; this is the case with the body and soul, and generally with the parts of a natural whole; lastly, when a nature subsists ἐν ἑτέρῳ, in an hypostasis distinct from its natural hypostasis; this is the case with the humanity in the eternal person of the Word.[67]

These explanations solve the problem in the orthodox sense. Contrary to the Monophysite view, the humanity

[64] III, 3, col. 993. St. John calls it also οὐσιωδής (*ibid.*), *i.e.*, true and real, to distinguish it from a union κατὰ φαντασίαν.

[65] Ὑπόστασις δὲ τὸ μερικόν (ἐστι) καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὸ ὑφεστὸς, οὐσία τις μετὰ συμβεβηκότων, τὴν καθ' αὐτὸ ὕπαρξιν, ἰδιαιρέτως καὶ ἀποτετμημένως τῶν λοιπῶν ὑποστάσεων ἐνεργείᾳ καὶ πράγματι κληρωσαμένη (*De duab. volunt.*, 4, col. 132, 133; cf. *Cont. iacob.*, 8, col. 1439).

[66] III, 9, col. 1016, 1017; *Cont. iacob.*, 11, col. 1441; *De nat. composita*, 5, col. 120.

[67] *Contra iacob.*, II, 12, col. 1441; *De nat. compos.*, 6, col. 120.

assumed by the Word does not lose its φύσις; nor is it ἰδιοσύστατος, as the Nestorians claimed; it is ἐνυπόστατος: it subsists in the Word.[68] The union of both natures — the divine and the human — is then καθ' ὑπόστασιν, and continued even during the *triduum mortis*. Although they were separated one from the other, the body and soul of Jesus Christ remained united to the Word; nay, they did not form two persons, for they subsisted in the one personality of the Word; whilst being divided locally (τοπικῶς), they were close to each other ὑποστατικῶς διὰ τοῦ Λόγου.[69]

By the fact of the hypostatic union, the person in Jesus Christ has ceased to be simple and has become compound, σύνθετος, not indeed that the personality of the Word has changed, but because, if we consider the whole, the person together with its natures, Christ is a being composed not of one, but of two natures.[70]

Moreover, the union of the Word with the humanity naturally recalled that of the soul and body in man. This was an old comparison, that had long been used and also qualified. St. John dwells rather on the qualifications.[71] No doubt, man consists of two natures that cannot be mutually reduced, body and soul;[72] however, as these two natures

[68] III, 9, col. 1017; *De nat. compos.*, 6, col. 120. Besides, St. John admits the Cyrillian formula, μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη (III, 1, col. 1024, 1025; *Cont. iacob.*, 22, col. 1460, 1461).

[69] III, 27, col. 1097.

[70] III, 7, col. 1009; IV, 5, col. 1109.

[71] III, 3, col. 992, 993; *Contra iacob.*, 54–57, col. 1464–1468; *De nat. compos.*, 7, col. 120, 121.

[72] The reader will observe that St. John had no idea of an incomplete substance forming with another incomplete substance a complete substance and one only nature. However, as may be readily seen, he comes necessarily to that idea. Besides he remarks that, from the fact that the body and soul are two different natures, we cannot conclude that there are in Jesus Christ three natures, the body, the soul, and the divinity; for, in analyzing a compound we must count and add to-

can be found the same in several individuals, by their union they constitute a superior nature, a species whose characteristic is to be a "rational animal," which is the human nature or humanity. With Jesus Christ the case is quite different. Jesus Christ is but one individual; the Word and the humanity do not form a χριστότης, in which several Christs can participate. Therefore, unlike body and soul, they do not constitute, through their union, one nature only.

After thus proving and explaining the hypostatic union, St. John draws some consequences, which he develops with much skill and on which we must say a few words.

The first of these consequences is the adoration due to the humanity of Jesus Christ, considered not apart from the Word, but in Him in whom it subsists.[73]

The second is that Jesus Christ is not the *servant,* but the Son of God: for, like the words father and son, the name servant denotes a personal relation, and therefore does not suit Jesus Christ, who is a divine person.[74]

A third consequence is the great principle of the *communicatio idiomatum,* of which the holy Doctor sets forth the rules and justifies the use more fully and clearly than had been done before.[75]

Another consequence of the hypostatic union is the mutual compenetration of the united natures (περιχώρησις), the deification (θείωσις) of the humanity by the divinity of the Word. This deification does not, indeed, substantially transform the humanity, but it does communicate to it the gifts, privileges, and power of action and operation of the

gether only the proximate and immediate elements (III, 16, col. 1065–1068).

[73] III, 8, col. 1013.

[74] III, 21, col. 1085.

[75] III, 4, col. 997–1000.

divinity, in the measure in which that humanity is capable of receiving them: *αὐτὴ μὲν (θεότης) τῶν οἰκείων αὐχημάτων τῇ σαρκὶ μεταδίδωσι.* Just as iron that has been heated red hot in the fire, burns as if it were fire, so the Saviour's body shares in His divine energy: *ἡ δὲ τοῦ Κυρίου σὰρξ τὰς θείας ἐνεργείας ἐπλούθησε.*[76]

It is also because of the hypostatic union that St. John Damascene asserts that in the God-man there was no human ignorance nor any real progress in wisdom and knowledge. There was in Jesus Christ neither hesitation nor deliberation nor doubt (*γνώμη, προαίρεσις*) regarding what He must do; His growth in wisdom was merely apparent and economical. The Saint does not hesitate to call those who hold the contrary, Nestorians.[77]

He takes the same standpoint when he comes to speak of the passions and corruptibility of the body of Christ. He admits indifferent passions, anger (*θυμός*), sadness and weariness (*ἡ λύπη καὶ ἡ ἀδημονία*), and also fear (*ἡ δειλία*), at least inasmuch as it is the instinctive trepidation of the soul in the presence of some danger or death, but not inasmuch as it results from ignorance or pusillanimity. The evil passions are set aside. Nay, even the motions of the indifferent passions did not anticipate, in the Saviour, the use of reason and remained perfectly under its control.[78]

The body of Jesus was capable of suffering and experiencing the needs and infirmities of the vegetative and sensitive life.[79] It was subject to partial corruptibility the same as that to which are subject the aliments in the body and the

[76] III, 7, col. 1012; 17, col. 1068–1072; *Contra iacob.*, 52, col. 1461.

[77] III, 14, col. 1044; 21, 22, col. 1084–1088; *De duab. volunt.*, 38, col. 177.

[78] III, 20, 23, col. 1084, 1088, 1089; *De duab. volunt.*, 36, 37, col. 176, 177.

[79] However, among the vegetative functions, St. John excludes *τὸ δὲ σπερματικὸν καὶ γεννητικόν* as useless in Christ (*De duab. voluntat.*, 37, col. 176).

elements of the body that are discarded by perspiration, saliva, etc., in proportion as others come to replace them; this is what the author calls τομὴ καὶ ῥεῦσις (*sectio et diffluxio*). It was also subject to that corruptibility which is identical with the sufferings that tend to bring about the destruction of the body,— hunger, thirst, death; but there is another more complete corruption, the total dissolution and disorganization of the elements of which the body consists (διαφθορά): from this the Saviour's body was and could not but be exempt; for it would have been against His dignity to experience it.[80]

There remains the question of the two wills and operations in Jesus Christ. When St. John wrote, hardly more than fifty years had passed since the controversy had been definitively settled by the Sixth General Council, and it might still seem no useless task to justify that solution.

In this the holy Doctor faithfully follows St. Maximus. Like him, he notes down with care the various meanings of the word *will*. The act of the will (θέλησις) is one thing, and the act of willing simply (τὸ θέλειν) or willing this or that, in this or that way (τό τι καὶ πῶς θέλειν) is another; what we will, the object of our willing (τὸ θελετόν), is one thing, the active principle of the willing (τὸ θελετικόν) is another, and also the subject that wills (ὁ θέλων). Now, if it is true that the object of the willing and the way of willing vary with each individual, and depend, in some measure, on the person, because they depend on the free-will,[81] it is certain that the will — both as a faculty and as an act — the active principle of the willing and the willing simply

[80] III, 28, col. 1097–1100; *De duab. volunt.*, 36, col. 173–176.

[81] III, 14, col. 1036, 1040; *De duab. volunt.*, 24, col. 153: τὸ θελετικόν, οὐ φυσικὸν μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ γνωμικὸν καὶ ὑποστατικόν. This does not mean that the free-will belongs to the person, not to the nature, for by his nature man is αὐτεξούσιος, just as he is θελητικός (III, 14, col. 1037, 1041; 18, col. 1076), but each individual uses his free-will as he likes.

belong to the nature, for each man can will, and as a matter of fact, does will.[82] Since in Jesus Christ the two natures — the divine and the human — were complete, there were in Him two wills and two free-wills: two wills, we say, *distinct* but not *opposed*. The problem of their relations is easily solved: the human will of Christ, which was not inclined towards evil, remained subject always to the divine will and willed only what the latter willed; but it willed it *humanly* and *freely: ἤθελε μὲν αὐτεξουσίως κινουμένη ἡ τοῦ Κυρίου ψυχὴ, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνα αὐτεξουσίως ἤθελεν ἃ ἡ θεία αὐτοῦ θέλησις ἤθελε θέλειν αὐτήν.*[83] In consequence of the *περιχώρησις*, the Saviour's human will was deified, as well as His whole humanity.[84]

What has been said of the will applies also to every operation (*ἐνέργεια*). As he has done above, the Saint lays down here very accurate distinctions: *Ἕτερον οὖν ἐνέργεια, καὶ ἕτερον τὸ ἐνεργεῖν, καὶ ἕτερον τό τι καὶ πῶς ἐνεργεῖν, καὶ ἕτερον τὸ ἐνεργητὸν, τουτέστι τὸ ἐνέργημα, καὶ ἕτερον τὸ ἐνεργετικὸν, καὶ ἕτερον ὁ ἐνεργῶν.*[85] The word *ἐνέργεια* may designate either the faculty of acting or the action itself; but at all events, and whatever definition is given, we must always assert that *ἐνέργεια* is an integral and necessary part of the nature, and that, without it, there is mere nothing: *Καὶ ἁπλῶς εἰπεῖν, ἐνέργειά ἐστι φυσικὴ, ἡ ἑκάστης οὐσίας δύναμίς τε καὶ κίνησις, ἧς χωρὶς μόνον τὸ μὴ ὄν.*[86] If then we acknowledge in Jesus Christ a human nature, we must also acknowledge in Him, besides

[82] *De duab. volunt.*, 24, col. 153; *De fide orth.*, III, 14, col. 1036, 1040.

[83] III, 13, 14, 18, col. 1033 . . . 1074–1076; *De duab. voluntat.*, 26–29; 39–42, col. 157 and foll., 177 and foll. Hence St. John admits in Jesus Christ but one *θελετὸν γνωμικόν*, *i.e.*, one object willed deliberately by the two wills (III, 14, col. 1036, 1037). Cf. the note on this text. Concerning the various senses of the word *γνώμη*, see III, 14, col. 1045.

[84] III, 17, col. 1069, 1072.

[85] *De duab. volunt.*, 35, col. 172.

[86] *De duab. volunt.*, 34, col. 172.

divine attributes and operations, human faculties and operations.[87] There are, then, in Him two operations as well as two free wills and two natures.

What is the mutual relation of these two kinds of operation? The same relation that exists between the natures,— that of a close union without confusion. As the two acting natures are united in the identity of person, one does not act without the other, so that the latter shares, in some way, in the action of the former. For instance, if we consider the human actions of Jesus Christ, besides the fact that the Word is, through the humanity, the responsible principle thereof, the divinity concurs in these actions by effecting that part of them which is superhuman — such as to be born of a virgin, walk on the sea, etc.— and imparting to them their redeeming and saving efficacy. On the contrary, if we consider His divine actions, we see that often the humanity is the organ thereof, and concurs in these actions by some external and visible gesture — an extension of the hand or a touch — of which the Saviour makes use to exercise His omnipotence.[88]

It is this intimate union of the two operations — divine and human — that Dionysius wished to illustrate by means of the expression καινή τις θεανδρικὴ ἐνέργεια in his fourth letter to Caius. This expression denotes the unity of the person in whom the two kinds of operations converge, and how these operations interpenetrate one another, as it were. The περιχώρησις that bound together the natures, also bound together their respective activities: Ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη αὐτοῦ (Χριστοῦ) ἐνέργεια θεία ἦν ἤγουν τεθεωμένη, καὶ οὐκ ἄμοιρος τῆς θείας αὐτοῦ ἐνεργείας, καὶ ἡ θεία αὐτοῦ ἐνέργεια οὐκ ἄμοιρος τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης αὐτοῦ ἐνεργείας, ἀλλ' ἑκατέρα σὺν τῇ ἑτέρᾳ θεωρουμένη.[89]

[87] *Ibid.; De fide orthodoxa,* III, 15, col. 1045.
[88] III, 15, col. 1057–1060; *De duab. volunt.,* 42, 43, col. 181–184.
[89] III, 19, col. 1077–1081.

Whilst St. John Damascene develops his Christology at length, he devotes to Soteriology not even one chapter of his great work. However, we can gather up here and there a few scattered thoughts that are in no way original. In the work of our salvation, he observes, all the attributes of God are made manifest,— His goodness, justice and wisdom,[90] and in that work all the mysteries of Jesus Christ concur;[91] however, it is the cross alone which, after all, saves us.[92] Sin had reduced us to slavery; it had made us liable to punishment and subject to a curse. Jesus Christ takes our place;[93] in our stead He takes the curse upon Himself;[94] He pays our ransom to God; for it is not to Satan that He has given His blood (*absit!*), but to His Father. He offers Himself as a sacrifice,[95] appeases His wrath in His blood, and becomes the propitiation (ἱλαστήριον) for our sins.[96] In consequence we are restored to freedom, delivered from the curse, and united to Jesus Christ,— all this through His death.[97]

As we have already remarked, St. John, like St. Gregory of Nazianzus, condemns the juridical theory of Satan's rights that had been held by Origen and St. Gregory of Nyssa. However, he retains the latter's theory regarding the abuse of power, and also his comparison of death and the devil deceived by God. For, whilst the devil and death were striving to get hold of the humanity of Jesus Christ, they were caught by the hook of His divinity, and death

[90] III, 1, col. 984.
[91] IV, 13, col. 1137.
[92] IV, 11, col. 1128, 1129.
[93] Τὸ ἡμέτερον ἀναδεχόμενος πρόσωπον, III, 25, 27, col. 1093, 1096; *In epist. II ad Corinth.*, V, 22; *In epist. I ad Timoth.*, II, 26 (*P. G.*, XCV, 736, 737, 1004).
[94] *In epist. ad Galat.*, III, 13 (*P. G.*, XCV, 796).
[95] III, 27, col. 1096.
[96] *In epist. ad Rom.*, III, 24, 25 (*P. G.*, XCV, 464, 465).
[97] *In epist. ad Ephes.*, I, 1 (*P. G.*, XCV, 821).

itself, which received a deadly blow from the vivifying flesh it had endeavored to devour, had to give back those whom it had already devoured.[98]

§ 4. The Church and the Sacraments.

St. John Damascene gives no theory of the Church. As has been remarked, he looks upon her as the living rule of faith, and unhesitatingly proclaims her doctrinal and disciplinary independence from temporal princes. The Church must not be ruled by imperial decrees, but by the councils and the canons enacted by them; the Apostles, and not the emperors, have received the power to bind and loose.[99] On the subject of St. Peter's primacy, St. John repeats the words of his predecessors: St. Peter is the leading coryphæus of the New Testament (ὁ τῆς νέας διαθήκης κορυφαιότατος), the worthy leader of the Church which he steers safely (ἐπάξιος πρόεδρος), her ruler and foundation.[100]

Nor do we find in Damascene's writings any theory regarding the sacraments in general. However, a remark which the Saint makes in connection with baptism, can be applied to all similar rites; *viz.*, "visible elements are the symbols of spiritual [realities]," [101] *i.e.*, Sacraments are signs of grace.

Baptism is studied in the IVth book, 9, of the *De fide orthodoxa*. There are several kinds of baptism, and among them, the baptism of Jesus Christ, the laborious baptism (penance), and that of blood. The matter of Christian

[98] III, 1, col. 984; 27, col. 1096, 1097.

[99] *De imaginibus, Orat.* I, col. 1281; II, 12, col. 1296; 16, col. 1301, 1304.

[100] *Homil. in transfig. Domini*, 2, 6, 9, 16 (*P. G.*, XCVI, 548, 553, 560, 569).

[101] IV, 9, col. 1121.

baptism is water, the special property of which is to cleanse, but the water into which the Holy Spirit has come down, in virtue of a preparatory blessing (*δι' ἐντεύξεως καὶ ἐπικλήσεως*).[102] The ablution is accompanied by an invocation of the Trinity, which is just as necessary as baptism itself and which, once pronounced, is the reason why baptism cannot be repeated.[103]

Christian baptism represents the death of Jesus Christ, and this is why St. Paul says that we are baptized in Christ and in His death.[104] It remits sins, confers the Holy Ghost in proportion to the preparation and spiritual cleansing (*προκαθάρσεως*) one brings to it, and is placed as a seal upon those who receive it. It is *παλιγγενεσία καὶ σφραγὶς καὶ φυλακτήριον καὶ φωτισμός*.[105]

It is likely that St. John Damascene refers vaguely to confirmation when he speaks of the unction with oil that accompanies baptism.[106] He does not dwell on the subject. On the other hand, he unfolds with a great deal of care his eucharistic teaching (*De fide orthodoxa,* IV, 13). This teaching presents no striking characteristics, and it would be easy to point out the authors that have contributed its elements and phraseology.

He begins with an explicit assertion of the real presence. In the Eucharist, the bread becomes the body of Jesus Christ. and the wine mixed with water, His blood.[107] *Οὐκ ἔστι τύπος ὁ ἄρτος καὶ οἶνος τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ (μὴ γένοιτο) ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου τεθεωμένον*.[108] This assertion is

[102] Col. 1121.
[103] Col. 1117, 1120.
[104] Col. 1120.
[105] Col. 1121.
[106] IV, 9, 13, col. 1125, 1141.
[107] Col. 1141.
[108] Col. 1148.

solidly founded on the words of Jesus Christ Himself, which he frequently recalls.[109] At times, it is true, the bread and wine are called the ἀντίτυπα of the Saviour's body and blood; but this is said of the bread and wine before the consecration. Again, the holy mysteries are called the antitypes of future things (ἀντίτυπα τῶν μελλόντων), because through them we share in the divinity of Jesus Christ,— that divinity which we shall enjoy later only by intelligence and contemplation (νοητῶς, διὰ μόνης τῆς θέας).[110]

How are we to conceive the fact that bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ? In two passages, the Saint presents that mystery as the result of a sort of impanation, a union of the divinity of the Logos with the bread and wine. Just as God unites His grace to the water and oil of baptism, so, in the Eucharist, He has joined (συνέζευξεν) His divinity to the elements, making them His body and blood. Just as charcoal is wood joined to fire, "in like manner also the bread of the communion is not bread only, but [bread] united with the divinity" (ἡνωμένος θεότητι).[111] However, this is not St. John's own opinion. He holds, first, that the eucharistic body of Christ is His historical body, that which He took from the Blessed Virgin; that this body does not come into the holy mysteries by adduction, as though the body which ascended into heaven, returned thence; it is produced in the sacred mysteries by way of conversion: "The bread and the wine are changed (μεταποιοῦνται) into God's body and blood." This may be illustrated by a comparison. Just as, in ordinary meals, the bread and wine are changed into our bodies, those very bodies that were ours before we ate, "so the bread of the prothesis and the wine and water are supernaturally changed

[109] Col. 1140, 1148.
[110] Col. 1152, 1153.
[111] Col. 1141, 1144, 1149.

(μεταποιοῦνται) into the body and blood of Christ, so that there are not two [different] bodies, but one only — the body of Christ." [112]

How can this be? It is useless to seek for any other explanation than the power of God, the power of the Holy Ghost that works in that mystery. God created everything by His word; the Logos became incarnate through His will alone; likewise He said: *"This is my body, this is my blood, do this in commemoration of me,"* and it was done as He had spoken and because He had spoken. The Holy Spirit, through whom God has made all things and who gave to Mary her fecundity, becomes, by means of the epiclesis, "the rain to this new tillage." [113]

As has been already noted, St. John Damascene plainly ascribes the change of the eucharistic elements to the Holy Ghost, who is invoked at the moment of the epiclesis, even excluding the words of the institution. This, as has been observed by some critics,[114] results from his error on the subject of the word ἀντίτυπα. According to the Saint, this word, when used by ancient writers, does not designate the consecrated elements, but only the bread and wine in their natural state. But, on the other hand, as this word is used in the liturgy of St. Basil after the words of institution, but before the epiclesis, to designate the *oblata,* he infers that at that particular moment the consecration has not yet taken place, and will be wrought only through the epiclesis. This was another error, which was far more serious than the first, and to which Greek theology has clung.

Since the eucharistic flesh of Jesus Christ is His true body, it is a life-giving flesh, nay a vivifying spirit (πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν), since it has been conceived through the operation

[112] Col. 1145.
[113] Col. 1140, 1141, 1145.
[114] Cf. F. Varaine, *L'épiclèse eucharistique,* p. 53 and foll.

of the Holy Ghost.[115] Besides, as it is hypostatically united to the divine nature, it causes those who receive it with the proper dispositions to share in that divine nature: *μετέχουσι, καὶ κοινωνοὶ θείας φύσεως γίνονται.*[116] Moreover, communion remits sins, cleanses and strengthens both body and soul, renders the faithful members of Jesus Christ and unites them to the Holy Ghost and among themselves.[117] Strange to say, the holy Doctor says nothing of the Eucharist as the principle of bodily resurrection.

Of the Eucharist as a sacrifice, he says but little. Being prefigured by Melchisedech's offering, it is "that pure and bloodless sacrifice which the Lord through the prophet said is offered to Him from the rising to the setting of the sun."[118]

St. John's writings contain but a few brief allusions to the other sacraments. The *Epistula de confessione* that appears among his works cannot be regarded as authentic.[119]

§ 5. Worship and Devotions. Eschatology.

St. John Damascene is not only the echo of the learned in the most sublime problems of dogma; he is also the echo of the rank and file of Christians by his attachment to the popular and, we may say, praiseworthy beliefs and practices of the time in which he lived.

Next to Christ he places Mary as high and close to God as possible; we cannot praise her too highly; she is *ὑπερυμνητός*.[120] John is acquainted with all the current nar-

[115] Col. 1152.
[116] *De imaginibus, Orat.* III, 26, col. 1348.
[117] Col. 1148, 1152, 1153.
[118] Col. 1149, 1152.
[119] *P. G.*, XCV.
[120] IV, 14, col. 1153. The whole chapter treats of the Blessed Virgin.

ratives that relate to her birth, presentation and life in the temple.[121] Against the Nestorians, he upholds her divine maternity;[122] against the Antidicomarianites, her perpetual virginity *ante, intra,* and *post partum.*[123] He asserts her absolute sanctity.[124] He believes in the incorruption of her body after death, and in her bodily assumption, of which he describes the wonderful circumstances, according to the apocrypha.[125]

After the Blessed Virgin, we must honor (τιμητέον) the saints. They are the children and heirs of God, the friends of Jesus Christ, the patrons and protectors of the world and of the faithful, for whom they intercede. Not only their souls are worthy of our homages, but also the relics of their bodies, which were formerly the temples of the Holy Spirit.[126]

We owe special adoration (προσκυνητέον) to the cross, because of its contact with the body of Jesus Christ. The same may be said of the nails and the spear that pierced the side of the Saviour, and, with due proportion, of His clothes and cradle, the cave where He was born, Golgotha and the places where He dwelt here below.[127]

We need not recall the Saint's defense of the veneration of images: it has been already studied. We may notice, however, as a last characteristic, the high esteem in which he holds the monastic life and the state of virginity. To the latter subject he has devoted a whole chapter, the 24th of the IVth book of his exposition of the orthodox faith.

[121] Col. 1157, 1160. Cf. also *Homil. I in dormitionem B. V. Mariae,* 6 (*P. G.,* XCVI, 708).

[122] Col. 1160, 1161; III, 12, col. 1028, 1029; *Cont. iacob.,* 84, col. 1484.

[123] Col. 1161; *In nativit. B. V. Mariae,* 5 (*P. G.,* XCVI, 668).

[124] *Homil. in annuntiationem B. V. Mariae* (*P. G.,* XCVI, 648 and foll.); *Homil. II in nativit. B. V. Mariae,* 4 (*ibid.,* 684).

[125] *In dormition. B. V. Mariae,* homil. I, 10, 12; II, 14, 18; III, 3 (*P. G.,* XCVI, 716, 720, 741, 748, 749, 757).

[126] IV, 15, col. 1164, 1165.

[127] IV, 11, col. 1129, 1132.

Of the problems of Christian eschatology St. John Damascene has treated but one at some length against the Manicheans, *viz.*, the resurrection of the body.

The end of the world will be preceded by the coming of Antichrist. Born of fornication, and the tool of the devil who will dwell in him, Antichrist will seduce souls and be adored in the temple of Jerusalem. He will put to death Henoch and Elias, after they have reappeared to convert the Jews; but he will be utterly destroyed by Jesus Christ coming down from heaven.[128]

His defeat will be followed by the general resurrection. The same earthly and mortal body that man had here below, will be revivified, *i.e.*, reunited to his soul. To prove the fact of the resurrection, St. John appeals to Scripture, Bible history, and divine justice, which must punish or reward both the body and the soul. The possibility of the resurrection depends entirely on God's omnipotence.[129]

After the resurrection, the final judgment will take place. Only two kinds of sentences will be pronounced. The devil and his demons, Antichrist and the wicked, shall be condemned and cast into eternal fire, for, after death, it is impossible for sinners to be converted. .Unlike our fire, the fire of hell will not be material (οὐχ ὑλικόν), but such as God knows (οἷον ἂν εἰδείη ὁ θεός).[130] On the contrary, the elect will be called to live for ever with Jesus Christ and His angels, in the joy of divine contemplation and praise.[131]

We may notice that St. John speaks neither of prayers for the dead nor of purgatory; nay, he seems not to accept

[128] IV, 26, col. 1216, 1217.
[129] IV, 27, col. 1220–1225.
[130] IV, 27, col. 1228; cf. *Dialog. cont. manich.*, 75 (*P. G.*, XCIV, 1573, 1575).
[131] IV, 27, col. 1228.

belief in purgatory in his *Dialogue* against the Manicheans.[132] Yet we know from other sources that the Greek Church at that time prayed for the departed.

[132] Col. 1573.

CHAPTER XII

LATIN THEOLOGY IN THE AGE OF CHARLEMAGNE

§ 1. Theologians.

WHILST the literary and artistic progress that was originated by Charlemagne — the Carolingian renaissance, as it has been called — was truly a new beginning, signalizing the dawn of a new era, which, interrupted for a while, continued in the Middle Ages, it must be confessed that, under his reign, theology remained outside that revival and clung to the past instead of turning towards the future. The epoch of the Fathers and great writers was past; treatises on dialectics were the only symptoms of the rise of Scholasticism. The Carolingian theologians were content with studying and reproducing the ancients — especially St. Augustine and St. Gregory — and assimilating their teaching as best they could, so as to meet the new needs.

This is why we may fitly conclude this volume with a sketch of theology during the age of Charlemagne. From the viewpoint of the history of dogmas, the Carolingian revival belongs to antiquity.[1] However, we shall not extend this outline much beyond the end of the great Emperor's reign (814); a study of the whole Carolingian period would take us too far. Within the limits thus marked out we

[1] "The history of dogma in the Middle Ages," writes Harnack, "begins, strictly speaking, with the age of Cluny" (*Lehrb. der D.-G.*, III, p. 271; English transl., vol. V, p. 275). It seems to me also that the history of the controversies about the *Filioque* and Adoptianism under Charlemagne, is the natural and necessary complement of what has been said about the Trinitarian and Christological doctrines.

shall treat only of the most important doctrinal events [2] and note the few special teachings that were more firmly established. A complete review of the Latin theology under Charlemagne, as a whole, would be but a useless repetition of what has been said already.

At the end of the 7th and during the first two-thirds of the 8th century, religious and theological knowledge took refuge mainly in the Celtic and Anglo-Saxon schools of England. The rudiments of the Greek and Roman culture, first brought to Canterbury by St. Augustine, and then by Theodore of Tarsus, were eagerly treasured up and studied. St. Bede sheds a luster over the schools of Wearmouth and Jarrow in Northumbria; but these soon recede, as it were, before the school of York. From the school of York, where he had Egbert and Aelbert for his masters, and where he himself had taught for a while, came the Northumbrian Alcuin,[3] the best of Charlemagne's theologians, and together with him, the organizer, in France, of the system of schools and studies planned by the Emperor. Alcuin, who was born about the year 735, first came to France about 781–789, and definitively took up his abode there in 792. He died in 804. He restored to the continent the traditions of scientific lore that had been driven out by the barbarians, and combined in himself and in the schools which he founded, with the insatiable desire for knowledge that characterizes his race, that genius for order and discipline which is the property of the Latin and Roman mind. Whilst it is true that, in

[2] The Western controversy about images has been already recorded; cf. chapt. X, § 7.

[3] Works in *P. L.*, C, CI. Studies: F. Monnier, *Alcuin et Charlemagne*, 2d edit., Paris, 1863. F. Hamelin, *Essai sur la vie et les ouvrages d'Alcuin*, Rennes-Paris, 1873. K. Werner, *Alcuin und sein Jahrhundert*, 2d edit., Wien, 1881. A. F. West, *Alcuin and the Rise of the Christian Schools*, London, 1893. C. J. B. Gaskoin, *Alcuin, his Life and his Work*, London, 1904.

his biblical commentaries, he uses extensively the system of *deflorationes, i.e.,* a process which consists in compiling a commentary of passages gathered from ancient writers, and that his theology lacks personality and betokens merely an extensive patristic erudition, yet he realizes the help which theology can derive from sound philosophical studies and strives, by his own example, to bring home to others the same conviction.[4] In every respect, the Middle Ages are much indebted to him. Alcuin was not only a theologian and a philosopher, he was also a grammarian; in fact he strove to get some insight into every subject, since Charlemagne asked him questions on all kinds of subjects, and all branches of knowledge needed to be restored in France. The abbot of St. Mihiel, Smaragdus (about 760–825),[5] was also a grammarian, for we have from his pen a commentary on the grammar of Donatus, where he uses examples chosen from Christian in preference to profane authors. But Smaragdus was above all an exegete and a moralist, and it is only accidentally, so to speak, that he treated the dogmatic question of the *Filioque.*

His fame is surpassed by that of the bishop of Orleans, Theodulphus (bishop about 785, + 821),[6] of Gothic Italian or Spanish origin, whom Charles had succeeded in bringing to France. A cultivated and well-read man, thoroughly acquainted with both sacred and profane literature, a poet now

[4] Cf. what he says on this subject in the dedicatory epistle of his treatise on the Trinity, to Charlemagne, vol. CI, 12, and *Grammatica* (*ibid.,* col. 853, 854). Regarding the way in which the relations between faith and reason were then conceived, see especially G. Brunhes, *La foi chrétienne et la philosophie au temps de la renaissance carolingienne,* Paris, 1903.

[5] Works in *P. L.,* XCVIII, CII.

[6] Works in *P. L.,* CV. Studies: L. Baunard, *Théodulphe, évêque d'Orléans,* Orléans, 1860. E. Rzehulka, *Theodulf, Bischof von Orleans,* Breslau, 1875. Ch. Cuissart, *Théodulphe, évêque d'Orléans, sa vie et ses œuvres,* Orléans, 1892.

and then, and greatly esteemed for his theological learning, Theodulphus measured up to the Emperor's standard of what a bishop ought to be. However he died in prison (though most probably unjustly) for being implicated in a revolt against Louis le Débonnaire. Five years before (in 816) there had died another friend of Charlemagne, Leidradus,[7] a Bavarian by birth and archbishop of Lyons from 798 to 814, whose only extant writings consist of a treatise on baptism and a few letters, but who took a very active part in the Adoptianist controversy.

All these authors belong to France. We must also mention: in Spain, Heterius, bishop of Osma, and Beatus, abbot of Libana, who were the first to oppose the Adoptianist error of Elipandus and Felix of Urgel;[8] in Italy, the patriarch of Aquileia, Paulinus II (bishop about 787, + 802). He was Alcuin's friend and, like him, had cultivated grammar and profane literature, as well as the sacred sciences. There is still extant from him, together with some letters and polemical treatises, a handbook of Christian ethics, modeled after Julian Pomerius.[9] Except Alcuin's, all these names seem to be rather insignificant by the side of those that have been quoted at the beginning and the middle of this volume, and, still more, of course, by the side of those that have been quoted in the two preceding volumes. But, in order to pass an equitable judgment on these men, we must not judge them by what they have produced, but must take into account both the time when they lived and the difficulties they had to overcome; and then we may admire the mental tenacity and power whereby they strove to set them-

[7] Works in *P. L.*, XCIX.
[8] Works in *P. L.*, XCVI.
[9] Works in *P. L.*, XCIX. Studies: C. Giannoni, *Paulinus II, Patr. von Aquileia,* Wien, 1856. G. Foschia, *S. Paolino, patr. d'Aquileia ed il suo seculo,* Udine, 1884.

selves free from the barbarism that encompassed them on all sides, and to remain faithful to the glorious past of which they had received the inheritance.

§ 2. Trinitarian Controversy. The Filioque.[10]

The question of the *Filioque* was dealt with, under Charlemagne's reign, from two different points of view. On the one hand, the Emperor adopts the custom of having the symbol of Constantinople with the addition of the *Filioque* recited at Mass in his dominions, and urges the Pope — who refuses to do so — to adopt the same custom for the Roman Church. The Pope and the Emperor agree on the substance of the doctrine; they disagree merely on a question of formula and opportunity. On the other hand, Latin theologians begin to engage in controversy with the Greeks on the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit *a Filio*. The discussion no longer bears on a formula, but on the truth which it expresses: the Pope and the Emperor unite against a common foe. We must carefully distinguish these two aspects of the question, which, as can be readily seen, have by no means the same dogmatic importance. For the sake of clearness, I shall treat them separately, although some historians have confused them.

As we have seen, as early as the 5th and 6th centuries, after the example of St. Augustine, the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost *a Patre et Filio* was universally held in the Latin Church. Not only was it taught by the theologians, but it had gained admission into some professions of faith, for instance, that of Pastor of Galicia and the *Quicumque vult,* which was destined to have such great

[10] On this paragraph, cf. G. Dubois, *De conciliis et theologicis disputationibus apud Francos, Carolo Magno regnante, habitis,* Alençon, 1902.

authority.[11] Its introduction into the official symbol and liturgy was accomplished first by the Spaniards, then by Charlemagne, and lastly by the Popes.

In a council assembled at Toledo [12] for the solemn abjuration of Arianism by Reccared and his subjects, A. D. 589, we hear for the first time of the creed of Constantinople being recited with the addition of the *Filioque*. In that meeting, the king first read a declaration of faith, which he himself had composed. He added thereto the creeds of Nicæa and Constantinople, the latter with the formula: "Credimus et in Spiritum sanctum dominum et vivificantem, *ex Patre et Filio procedentem*." [13] Then the recently converted Gothic bishops pronounced twenty-three anathemas, the third of which defined the same doctrine; and lastly, at Reccared's request, the synod enacted that henceforth, after the Greek custom, the creed of Constantinople should be said at Mass before the *Pater* — no doubt, with the addition made by the king.[14] Thus, the doctrine of the *Filioque* entered at once both into the official formulary of the Church and into her liturgy.

Almost a century later, it made its way into the Gallican liturgy by another door — the preface of the Mass.[15] But, outside of Spain, the Church authorities were not particularly eager to admit it into the creeds. It is found neither in the profession of faith of the Lateran Council of the year 649,

[11] See K. Künstle, *Antipriscilliana*, p. 46 and foll., who, however, must not be blindly followed.

[12] The acts are given in Mansi, IX, 977 and foll.

[13] Mansi, IX, 981.

[14] This will be shown still better by our subsequent remarks.

[15] The first *contestatio* of the third Gallican Mass of Mone, the MS. of which dates back to the end of the 7th century, reads as follows: "Dignum et iustum est, vere equum et iustum est nos tibi gratias agere, omnipotens, aeterne deus, pater, unigenite, spiritus sancte ex patre et filio mystica processione subsistens" (*P. L.*, CXXXVIII, 867).

nor in that of the synod of Milan of 679,[16] nor in that of the council held at Rome under Agatho in 680.[17] Sole among the synods preparatory to the Sixth General Council, the Anglo-Saxon council of Heathfield, of 680, concludes its synodal letter with the words: "Glorificantes Deum Patrem . . . et Spiritum sanctum *procedentem ex Patre et Filio* inenarrabiliter." [18] This was not the creed of Constantinople.

The Spanish practice of saying or singing at Mass the creed of Constantinople with the addition, was probably adopted at the court of Charlemagne about the year 780. In fact, one of the reproaches made by Charles to the Seventh General Council of Nicæa, in the memorandum drawn from the *Libri carolini* and sent to Pope Hadrian in 794, was this: "Quod Tarasius non recte sentiat qui Spiritum sanctum non ex Patre et Filio, *secundum nicaeni symboli fidem,* sed ex Patre per Filium procedentem in suae credulitatis lectione profiteatur." [19] The king expressed his displeasure because Tarasius in the profession which he had read at the Seventh Council,[20] had not confessed the procession of the Holy Ghost *ex Patre et Filio,* as declared by the creed of Nicæa. Hence at that time, *i.e.,* in the year 794, the creed of Nicæa — which means Nicæa-Constantinople — was read at the imperial court with the Spanish addition. Was it already sung at Mass? The previous testimony does not say so; but, as we know for certain that it *was* sung at Mass in 808, we may reasonably suppose that Charlemagne had adopted

[16] *P. L.,* LXXXVII, 1265, in the letter of Damian of Pavia to the emperor Constantine.

[17] *P. L.,* LXXXVII, 1220.

[18] Bede, *Hist. eccles.,* IV, 17 (*P. L.,* XCV, 199). A noteworthy feature of this Council was that it was presided over by Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, the former monk of Tarsus.

[19] *P. L.,* XCVII, 1249: *In actione tertia.*

[20] Cf. Mansi, XII, 1122.

both the addition to the creed and the practice of singing the creed at Mass. However, this latter detail is of minor importance.

The addition of the *Filioque* to the creed of Constantinople was, then, getting a footing in France in the year 794. Some two or three years later, in 796 or 797, it was received officially in Upper Italy by a council of Forumiulii (Frioul), presided over by Paulinus of Aquileia.[21] The question was there clearly and expressly stated and answered. In his inaugural discourse, Paulinus granted that the councils of old had forbidden the making of new symbols of faith. But, he added, to comment upon former symbols and explain them — as was done for the creed of Nicæa by the Fathers of Constantinople — was not at all the same as to compose new ones. Hence, to add the explanation *Filioque* without changing the creed of Constantinople, was perfectly legitimate. Paulinus approves that addition which has become necessary "propter eos videlicet haereticos qui susurrant Spiritum sanctum solius esse Patris et a solo procedere Patre" (VII). He justifies its doctrine by scriptural and theological reasons (VIII), and lastly recites the creed together with the addition: "Et in Spiritum sanctum Dominum et vivificantem, qui ex Patre Filioque procedit" (XII).[22]

There still remained to be won over the Pope and the Roman Church. A first attempt was made by Charlemagne on the occasion of the Palestinian disturbances of 808. Some Latin monks, who had settled at Bethlehem, having sung the creed of Constantinople with the addition *Filioque* at Mass, were styled heretics and threatened with expulsion by the Greeks. They resisted, claimed that they were per-

[21] Acts in Mansi, XIII, 829 and *P. L.*, XCIX, 283.
[22] *P. L., loc. cit.*, p. 293.

fectly orthodox, and wrote to Pope Leo III,[23] asking him to have a patristic enquiry made on the subject of the *Filioque,* and to inform the emperor Charles, in whose chapel they had heard the creed with the addition sung.

The Pope acceded to the wishes of the monks. First he sent to them a profession of faith which had been sent to the churches of the East,[24] and which, whilst asserting the procession of the Holy Ghost *a Patre et Filio,* dwelt but moderately on that point and alluded to no controversy. Then he apprised Charlemagne of what had taken place. It was in consequence of that incident that the Emperor requested Theodulphus of Orleans to write his treatise *De Spiritu sancto,*[25] and convoked the council of Aix-la-Chapelle (November, 809).[26] The Council approved the writing of Theodulphus and declared itself for the doctrine of the *Filioque* and probably also for upholding the addition to the creed. At least, this can be inferred from what we are going to say.

After the council just mentioned, Charles sent to Rome an embassy made up of Bernhard, bishop of Worms, Adelard, abbot of Corbie, and Smaragdus, abbot of St. Mihiel, who were to carry to the Pope both the acts of the Council and a treatise of Smaragdus in support of the *Filioque.*[27] The messengers were to ask the Pope's explicit permission to sing the creed of Constantinople with the addition objected to by the Greeks. Smaragdus has left us an account of the interview between Leo III and Charles' ambassadors.[28]

[23] This is the *Epistula peregrinorum monachorum, P. L.,* CXXIX, 1257 and foll.

[24] *Epist.* XV, *P. L.,* CII, 1030 and CXXIX, 1260.

[25] *P. L.,* CV.

[26] Eginhard, *Annales,* DCCCIX (*P. L.,* CIV, 472); Mansi, XIV, 17 and foll.

[27] This is the *Epistula Caroli magni ad Leonem III papam a Zmaragdo abbate edita* (*P. L.,* XCVIII, 923 and foll., Mansi, XIV, 23 and foll.).

[28] *P. L.,* CII, 971; Mansi, XIV, 18.

The Pope fully approved the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost *a Filio;* but as to the addition of the *Filioque* and the singing of the creed with that addition, he refused to sanction it. Had he been consulted beforehand, he said, he certainly would not have approved these innovations; but now since the evil had been done, he saw but one remedy: *viz.,* to let the whole thing fall into oblivion by ceasing to sing the creed in the imperial chapel, the more so as it was not sung at Rome.

The Emperor could not be pleased with this solution. He paid no attention to it, and during his reign and that of his successors, the creed with the addition continued to be sung in the chapel of the palace, and gradually also in the churches of France and Germany, as attested by Walafrid Strabo (+ 849)[29] and Æneas of Paris, who wrote between 867 and 870.[30]

The Pope had but one thing to do, *viz.,* to protest. He did protest in a rather peculiar way: he had two silver shields hung up at the *confessio* of St. Peter, one in Greek, the other in Latin, bearing the text of the creed of Constantinople as it was recited in Rome, without the addition.[31] His successors persisted in this attitude, and till the 11th century, the singing of the creed was not prescribed at Rome by the *ordo* of the Mass. It was received there only in 1014, in consequence of the entreaties made by the Emperor St. Henry II (1002–1024) to Pope Benedict VIII (1012–1024).[32] Thus, at last, the Spanish custom won the day.

[29] *De ecclesiasticarum rerum exord. et increm.,* XXII (*P. L.,* XCIV, 947).

[30] *Liber adv. Graecos,* XCIII (*P. L.,* CXXI, 721).

[31] *Liber pontificalis,* II, p. 26.

[32] Berno, *Libellus de quibusdam rebus ad missae officium pertinentibus,* II (*P. L.,* CXLII, 1060, 1061). Cf. Tiethmar, *Chronicle,* VII, 1, ap. Duchesne, *Lib. pontific.,* II, 268, note. 3.

The reason the Popes refused to introduce into the creed the expression of a doctrine which they approved was fidelity to tradition and a measure of prudence against the repeated accusations of the Greeks, who were then beginning to show their opposition both to the doctrine and to the formula of the *Filioque*. As has been seen above,[33] St. Maximus had been obliged to plead before his countrymen the orthodoxy of Pope Martin I, who had used a similar formula, and show the synonymity of the two expressions ἐξ υἱοῦ and δι' υἱοῦ. The matter was dropped. However, from the insistence with which St. John Damascene rejects the procession of the Holy Ghost ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ some have inferred, not without reason, that, in doing so, the Saint meant to protest against the Latin terminology, the bearing of which he realized but imperfectly.

The clash that was sure to come sooner or later between the two churches took place at Gentilly. In the year 767 a council met there that was attended by some Greek legates sent to Pepin by Constantine Copronymus. The main topic was the question of images, but we learn from Addo that the discussion also bore on the procession of the Holy Ghost: "Facta est tunc temporis synodus, anno incarnationis Domini septingentesimo sexagesimo septimo, et quaestio ventilata inter Graecos et Romanos de Trinitate, et utrum Spiritus sanctus, sicut procedit a Patre, ita procedat a Filio."[34]

We know nothing more as regards the discussion and its conclusion; but we may safely suppose that it resulted in bringing out still more clearly the disagreement of the two churches, at least in terms, and in making them distrust each other. That disagreement, however, could be extenuated by prudent reserve in affirmations, and made harmless by an

[33] Page 194.
[34] *Chronicle, P. L.*, CXXIII, 125.

intelligent and broadminded exegesis, like that of St. Maximus. This was precisely, it seems, the Pope's intention; hence we see Hadrian's legates to the Seventh General Council unhesitatingly accept as orthodox the profession of faith of Tarasius which expressed belief in the procession of the Holy Ghost ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς δι' υἱοῦ.[35] But Charlemagne had no sympathy with theological diplomacy. Since St. Augustine had taught that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son, all the Church must follow suit and teach what he had taught; and since the Greeks seemed to use a different terminology, it became a duty to proclaim openly, by means of an addition to the creed, that they were wrong. Consequently the *Libri carolini* (III, 3, 8) sharply criticised the profession of faith of Tarasius and declared it inacceptable. Hadrian defended it, by drawing attention to the way of speaking of the ancient Fathers, both Greek and Latin.[36] The King's answer was the decision of the council of Frioul (796 or 797), which adopted the addition of the *Filioque* "propter eos videlicet haereticos qui susurrant Spiritum sanctum solius esse Patris, et a solo procedere Patre."

Although the Greeks were not mentioned in this decision, this was a blow directly aimed at them. In their turn, they took the offensive in the Bethlehem disturbances of 808, and accused the Latin monks who were singing the *Credo* with the *Filioque,* of heresy. The reader knows what followed; how, although approving the Latin belief in the doctrine that is implied by those words, Pope Leo III refused to admit them into the official creed, while Charles had the doctrine of the *Filioque* defined and its addition adopted by the council of Aix-la-Chapelle (809).

The stir that had been created in the East by the Bethle-

[35] Mansi, XII, 1122, 1145.
[36] *P. L.,* XCVIII, 1249 and foll.

hem incident seems to have subsided, and the controversy between Greeks and Latins, of which the reign of Charlemagne had witnessed but the beginning, came to a lull, which lasted till Photius' scandalous outburst, in 867. Then it assumed an acute character, which it may be said to have kept ever since. The Greek Church has since been several times reunited to Rome; but the reunion has always been loose and shortlived, and at each rupture she has not failed to declare that the disagreement regarding the *Filioque* made it obligatory for her to separate from the Latin Church.

§ 3. Christological Controversy. Spanish Adoptianism.[37]

The Trinitarian controversy of which we have spoken created but little excitement in the reign of Charlemagne. It was different with the Adoptianist heresy, with which we have now to deal.

At the time when that heresy arose, Spain was under three distinct rules. In the center and south, the Moors held sway. Their capital was Cordova. To the north-west, there lay the small indigenous kingdom of Oviedo; to the north-east, the

[37] Sources: (1) the writings of Elipandus (*P. L.*, XCVI), Felix of Urgel (*ibid.*) and the Spanish bishops who adopted their views (*ib.*, CI). The works of Alcuin and Agobard contain many quotations from writings of Felix that are no longer extant. (2) The writings of their opponents, Heterius and Beatus (*P. L.*, XCVI), Paulinus of Aquileia (*ib.*, XCIX), Alcuin (*ib.*, C, CI) and Agobard (*ib.*, CIV). (3) The acts of the councils that took up the subject (MANSI, XIII), the letters of Popes Hadrian and Leo III and of Charlemagne (references will be given in the footnotes), and the contemporary chronicles, especially the *Annals* of Eginhard (*P. L.*, CIV).— Studies: Most of the existing studies are old and form parts of complete histories of dogmas and heresies. The following especially may be consulted: J. BACH, *Die Dogmengeschichte des Mittelalters*, Wien, 1873, I, 102–146, where the texts are abundantly quoted. HEFELE-LECLERCQ, *Histoire des conciles*, III, 2. G. DUBOIS, *De conciliis et theologicis disputationibus apud Francos, Carolo Magno regnante, habitis*, Alençon, 1902. P. VUILLERMET, *Élipand de Tolède*, Brignais, 1911.

two marches of Navarra and Gothia formed a part of Charlemagne's Frankish kingdom.

Under the Moorish rule lived the first instigator of the new heresy, Elipandus, archbishop of Toledo, a haughty, stubborn, and exceptionally hot-tempered old man. It is no easy task to relate how he was led to profess Adoptianism; its origin, to which we shall revert later, is very obscure. Probably the controversy which Elipandus carried on about the year 782 against Bishop Migetius had some connection with the false views with which he himself was charged afterwards. Little is known of Migetius.[38] It seems he identified, in the Trinity, the (incarnate) Father with David, the (incarnate) Son with the man Jesus, and the (incarnate) Holy Ghost with the apostle St. Paul. Elipandus, who rebukes him for holding these strange views,[39] must have, on the contrary and by way of reaction, insisted on the distinction between the two elements — the divine and the human — in Jesus and thus perhaps gradually came to assume in the Word incarnate two sonships and, at least virtually, two sons of God, one, the true Son, the eternal Word, the other, the adopted son, the man. His letter to Migetius has several sentences that contain the whole Adoptianist teaching and could have been signed by a Nestorian. Take this, for instance: "Personam vero Filii non eam esse [credimus] quam tu asseris Patri et Spiritui sancto aequalem

[38] The only documentary sources we have concerning him are (1) a letter sent to him by Elipandus, before 782 (*P. L.*, XCVI, 859–867; (2) a letter of Elipandus to Abbot Fidelis, October, 785 (*ib.*, 918, 919); (3) a letter of Elipandus and the Spanish bishops to the bishops of Gaul, Aquitaine, and Austrasia (*ib.*, CI, 1321–1331); (4) a letter of Hadrian (in 785) to the Spanish bishops (*ib.*, XCVIII, 374 and foll.); (5) a letter of Saul of Cordova to Alvarus, in 862 (Florez, *España sagrada*, XI, p. 166). All these documents are analyzed in Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des conc.*, III, 2, p. 985 and foll.

[39] *Epist. cit.*, 3, col. 860, 861.

esse, quae facta est ex semine David secundum carnem in novissimo tempore, sed eam quae genita est a Deo Patre sine initio temporis, quae ante assumptionem carnis dixit per prophetam: *Ante colles ego parturiebar.*" [40] This letter was written before 782.

Quite likely, Elipandus sought to spread his opinion and met with opposition. He then wrote to Felix, bishop of Urgel, whose see, located in the march of Gothia, was under Charlemagne's rule. Felix was a learned man and esteemed for his cleverness. He agreed with Elipandus and approved the doctrine that, as man, Jesus Christ was only God's adopted Son, whereas, as the Word, He was His true Son.[41] He not only approved it, but proclaimed himself its champion and spread it throughout Septimania and Languedoc, whilst Elipandus was propagating it in Galicia and the Asturias. Many bishops accepted it; among them Ascarius, whose see is unknown, and abbot Fidelis, to whom Elipandus wrote on the subject.[42] The sect had a certain number of followers in Cordova, who supplied the leaders with arguments; [43] and it is to this center of error that Alcuin refers the origin of all the evil: "Maxime origo huius perfidiae de Cordua civitate processit." [44]

I have already said in substance in what the error of Elipandus and Felix consisted; a few more words will suffice to complete the exposition. The Adoptianists expressly admitted the divinity and eternity of the Word, His incarnation and hypostatic union with the human nature. The Word forms but one person with the humanity, which He united to Himself at the first moment of conception. This

[40] *Epist. cit.*, 7, col. 863; cf. 4, col. 861, 862.
[41] EGINHARD, *Annales, ann.* 792 (*P. L.*, CIV, 441).
[42] *P. L.*, XCVI, 918.
[43] ELIPANDUS, *Epist. V ad Felicem*, 3 (*P. L.*, XCVI, 881).
[44] *Epist. ad Laidrad. et Nefrid.* (*P. L.*, CI, 234).

meant a rejection, in principle, of Nestorianism.[45] But the Adoptianists espoused that same error in another way. They made sonship an attribute, not of the person, but of the nature, and distinguished in Christ, because of His two natures, two sonships in relation to God. By His divine nature and as the Word, He is the true Son of God: he is so *natura, veritate, proprietate, genere, nativitate atque substantia;* but, by His human nature, He is Son of God *non natura, sed gratia, electione, voluntate, placito, praedestinatione, assumptione et caetera his similia:* in a word, He is only the adopted Son, since the humanity was not begotten, but only adopted by God.[46]

What does this mean, *adopted?* Under the pen of Elipandus, who seems to have borrowed the term from the Mozarabic liturgy, *adoptio* is synonymous with *assumptio.* To say that God has adopted the humanity, is to say, first of all, that He has hypostatically united the humanity unto Himself; and this is why the Bishop of Toledo is indignant at his adversaries who object to that terminology and whom he regards as Docetae and opponents of the Incarnation.[47] But, under the pen of Felix, who considerably expanded the system of Elipandus and developed its consequences, the word *adoptio* has a different meaning. Besides the physical sense in which Elipandus takes it, Felix employs it in a juridical sense, to designate the act by which God makes the man Jesus, through the grace of union and sanctifying grace,

[45] Elipand., *Symbol. fid. elipand.* (*P. L.,* XCVI, 917); *Epist.* IV, 5, 13, 14; Felix, ap. Alcuin, *Adv. Felic. libri septem,* V, 1, col. 188; ap. Agobard, *Lib. adv. Felic.,* XXXIII, col. 59; *Epist. episcop. Hispan. ad episc. Galliae,* X, XI (*P. L.,* CI).

[46] Felix, ap. Agobard, *Lib. adv. Fel.,* XVI, XVII; cf. IX: ap. Alcuin, *Adv. Felic. lib. septem,* II, 3; IV, 2; Elipand., *Epist. ad Fidel.,* col. 918; *Symbol. fid. elip.,* col. 917; *Epist. episc. Hisp. ad episc. Gall.,* II, IX.

[47] Elipandus, *Epist.* IV, 2, 5, 6; III, 3; *Epist. episc. Hisp. ad ep. Gall.,* I, XV.

His adopted Son, the first and most perfect of His adopted sons, who are the just.[48]

In Jesus Christ, then, there are, as regards God, two sonships; and yet, the Adoptianists say, there is but one Son.[49] This truth they are bent on preserving, although their writings contain many expressions that amount to a flat denial thereof. For they were able to distinguish in Jesus Christ two distinct sonships only by isolating His two natures and speaking of them as of two persons, two sons. Notwithstanding their efforts to the contrary, the dualism that is in their minds betrays itself now and then: "Quia non per *illum* qui natus est de virgine visibilia condidit [Deus], sed per *illum* qui non est adoptione sed genere, neque gratia sed natura." [50] "*Qui* susceptus est cum *eo qui* suscepit communcupatur Deus — impassibilis in *suo,* passibilis in *alieno.*" [51]

But once the man in Jesus Christ is considered thus abstractly, apart from the Word in whom he subsists, it is but natural that he should be regarded as an ordinary man, and that the native state and infirmities of mere humanity should be ascribed to him. Felix pushed these consequences to the extreme and occasionally made use of expressions that closely resemble those employed by Theodotus or Paul of Samosata. For instance, Jesus, as man, is by His condition, a servant, *servus, servus conditionalis,* and the Word is the Lord of that servant or slave, *Dominus servi.*[52] Jesus did not know the day of judgment nor the things about which

[48] Felix, ap. Alcuin, *Adv. Fel. lib. septem,* II, 14; Alcuin, *Lib. adv. haeres. Felic.,* XXXVI.

[49] Felix, *ap.* Agobard., *Lib. adv. Felic.,* XIX.

[50] *Symbol. fid. elip.,* col. 917; cf. Elipand., *Epist.* IV, 10.

[51] Felix, ap. Alcuin, *Adv. Fel. lib. septem,* VII, 3; V, 11; ap. Agobard., *Lib. adv. Fel.,* XIX. Cf. Paulin. of Aquileia, *Contra Felic. Urgel.,* III, 37.

[52] Felix, ap. Alcuin, *Adv. Fel. lib. septem,* III, 3; VI, 3, 4; Elipand., *Epist.* IV, 10; *Epist. episc. Hisp. ad episc. Gall.,* XI.

He asked questions;[53] in Himself He was neither impeccable nor *naturaliter* good; He was so only *ex dono gratiae*.[54] His adoption by grace did not differ essentially from ours; only it was more perfect.[55] Like us, after being born of the Blessed Virgin, He had to be born again through baptism.[56] It seems, from a text which is somewhat obscure, that Felix regarded Jesus as one who was spiritually dead and received His adopted sonship only in baptism.[57] Nay, through His union with the Word, the man Jesus did not really become God; He became so only nominally, *nuncupative Deus*.[58] The great principle of the *communicatio idiomatum* is thus ignored, and Nestorianism is plainly taught in passages like this: "Certe catholica fides credit quod non proprius Dei Filius qui de substantia Patris genitus est et per omnia Patri

[53] Felix, ap. Agobard., *Lib. adv. Fel.*, V; Paulinus of Aquileia, *Contra Felic.*, III, 12.

[54] Felix, ap. Paulin., *Contr. Fel.*, I, 30; III, 11; Alcuin, *Adv. Felic. lib. septem*, II, 18; V, 10; VII, 8.

[55] Alcuin, *Libell. adv. haeres. Felic.*, XXXVI; *Epist. episc. Hisp. ad ep. Gall.*, IX; *Symbol. fid. elip.*, col. 917.

[56] Alcuin, *Adv. Fel. lib. septem*, II, 16; *Epist. ad. Elip.*, V, col. 238; *Adv. Elip. lib. quatuor*, I, 16, col. 252.

[57] Ap. Alcuin, *adv. Fel. libri septem*, II, 16. Felix claims for Jesus a twofold birth, "primam videlicet quam suscepit ex Virgine nascendo; secundam vero quam initiavit in lavacro a mortuis resurgendo." Cf. Alcuin's discussion, *ibid.*, 16–18.

[58] Felix, ap. Alcuin, *Adv. Fel. libri sept.*, IV, 2. The whole passage, which is a fair summary of the views of Felix, reads as follows: "Dei Filius Dominus et redemptor noster juxta humanitatem, sicut in natura ita et in nomine, quamvis excellentius cunctis electus, verissime tamen cum illis communicat, sicut et in caeteris omnibus, id est, in praedestinatione, in electione, in gratia, in susceptione, in assumptione nominis servi, atque applicatione seu caetera his similia, ut idem qui essentialiter cum Patre et Spiritu sancto in unitate deitatis verus est Deus, ipse in forma humanitatis, cum electis suis, per adoptionis gratiam, deificatus fieret, et nuncupative Deus." Cf. Alcuin, *Adv. Fel. libri septem*, I, 1; V, 4; *Epist. ad Elip.*, III, col. 237; Paulin., *Contra Felic.*, I, 41.

similis pro nobis traditus sit, sed homo assumptus ab eo." [59]

The arguments to which the Adoptianists appealed in support of their opinion are known to us from their writings and those of their opponents. There were first those texts of Scripture which designate in Jesus Christ more particularly either the man or God, and which the Adoptianists pitted, as it were, one against the other, as asserting either His true or His adopted sonship.[60] Then, there were the testimonies of the Fathers: St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, St. Leo, St. Isidore, etc.[61] Incidentally the whole controversy occasioned a wonderful display of patristic erudition. However, among all the authorities that he alleged, Elipandus placed in the foreground several texts taken from the Mozarabic liturgy, which was used at Toledo and from which he quoted eight passages.[62] Lastly, the Adoptianists appealed to reason. Christ, as man, Felix said, has two fathers, God and David; now, no one can be the true son of two

[59] Felix, ap. Agobard., *Lib. adv. Felic.*, XXXVI; Elipand., *Epist.* IV, 13.

[60] Thus, *Prov.*, VIII, 25 and foll.; *Eccli.*, XXIV, 5; *Psalm.* CIX, 3; XLIV, 2; *Isaias*, XLV, 23, designate the true Son. On the contrary, *Mark*, XIII, 32; *Luke*, I, 80; XVIII, 19; *Matth.*, XVII, 5; *John*, I, 14; X, 35, 36; XIV, 28; *Rom.*, VIII, 29; 1 *Corinth.*, XI, 3; *Philipp.*, II, 7; 1 *John*, III, 2, and several passages of the Old Testament, *Deuteron.*, XVIII, 15; *Psalm.* II, 8; XXI, 23; XLIV, 8; *Isaias*, XI, 2, 3, etc., must be understood of the adopted Son. Cf., for instance, *Epist. episc. Hisp. ad episc. Gall.*, IX, col. 1324–1326.

[61] Elipandus, *Epist.* IV, 8–10; *Epist. episc. Hisp. ad episc. Gall.*, XIII. These testimonies are at times misquoted and misunderstood. Either our own adoption is referred to, or the Fathers take the word *adoptio* in the sense of *assumptio*. On this point, cf. J. Bach, *op. cit.*, p. 104–106, notes.

[62] *Epist.* IV, 11; cf. *Epist. episc. Hisp. ad episc. Gall.*, XIII. Scholars are now able to identify all these texts, thanks to Dom Férotin's edition of the Mozarabic *Liber sacramentorum*. Several of them are not *ad rem;* others must be understood in the sense of *assumptio*. They are discussed in Alcuin, *Adv. Elipand. libri quatuor*, II, 7.

fathers; hence, as man, Christ is the true son of David, from whom He holds His humanity, and the adopted son of God.[63] Again: Mary was *ancilla;* but "quid potuit de ancilla nasci nisi servus?"[64] Again: "Nullo modo credendum est ut omnipotens Deus Pater qui spiritus est de semetipso carnem generet."[65] Then Felix dwelt upon the fitness of his doctrine from the soteriological point of view. Our salvation, he remarked, is wrought through the grace of our adoption as children of God. But our grace is the grace of Jesus Christ, and we receive, and the Church receives, only what is in her Head and in our Head. If, then, ours is an adopted sonship, it is because there is also in Jesus Christ an adopted sonship; we have been adopted in Him and with Him.[66] Moreover, the Adoptianists, who — as has been said, and this was the fundamental cause of their error — looked upon sonship as an attribute of nature, and not of person, were convinced that their opinion was a mere consequence of the duality of natures in Jesus Christ, and did not shrink from calling their opponents Eutychians and Docetae; nay, Elipandus gave them the name of Arians and Bonosians.[67]

Before continuing the history of Adoptianism, we must

[63] Ap. Alcuin, *Adv. Felic. libri septem,* I, 12; III, 1.

[64] *Ibid.,* III, 3.

[65] *Ibid.,* III, 7.

[66] "Ita divina Scriptura loquitur ut ea quae capitis sunt, id est Christi, referantur ad corpus, id est Ecclesiam, et ea quae corporis sunt ascribantur capiti.— Nihil enim habere potest Ecclesia quod ad vitam et pietatem pertineat, nisi quod a capite suo, id est Christo, acceperit" (ap. Agobard., *Lib. adv. Felic.,* XXXVII). This conclusion is exactly the reverse of the conclusion arrived at by St. Athanasius. From the fact that Jesus Christ through the redemption is the principle of our adopted sonship, St. Athanasius concludes that He Himself was a true son by nature, whereas Felix concludes that He was, in some way, an adopted son.

[67] Elipandus, *Epist.* IV, 3, 19; *Epist. ad Fidelem,* col. 919; Alcuin, *Adv. Felic. lib. septem,* I, 8; II, 12; III, 17.

ask ourselves whence that error originated and why it was so readily welcomed in Spain. The case of Migetius may explain the attitude of Elipandus, but it cannot account for that of Felix and his friends. Attempts have been made to connect Adoptianism either with Mussulman monotheism or Visigothic Arianism or Photinianism.[68] But evidently, it is in close connection with the Nestorian system, which tends to make Christ's humanity a person by itself. The writings of Felix and Elipandus contain expressions that are absolutely Nestorian in tenor. How are we to account for that? Perhaps the Adoptianists, who expressly asserted the unity of person in Jesus Christ, failed to see all the consequences of that assertion, and reasoned on the point under discussion as though they held the contrary; the abstruse character of the problem might account for their error. But it may be also surmised that Nestorian books had been brought to Spain by the Arabs, who had been initiated into Greek philosophy by means of Syriac translations made by Nestorians.[69] It is natural, then, to suppose that into the pages

[68] I shall say but a few words on the view of Harnack (*Lehrbuch der DG.*, III, 275 and foll.; English transl., vol. V, pp. 281 and foll.), that Adoptianism is the legitimate continuation of the Chalcedonian and Augustinian theology, because the two natures, defined by the Council of Chalcedon, were after all mere Nestorianism, and because St. Augustine presented Jesus, as man, as preëminently the object of grace *gratis data* and gratuitous predestination. However, it must be observed that the opponents of Adoptianism certainly professed the Chalcedonian and Augustinian Christology; they were by no means disciples of St. Cyril, and yet they rejected the conclusions of Felix and Elipandus. The attitude of the Catholic theologians of to-day is exactly the same. Of course, Jesus, as man, being *prevented* (in the theological sense of the word) by grace, would be the adopted Son of God, *were He not already His true Son by the hypostatic union:* but if that union is posited, there is no room left for an adopted sonship. A true son and an adopted son as regards the same father are necessarily two sons, *i. e.*, two persons, as was realized by Alcuin, *Libell. adv. haeres. Felic.*, XXXV, col. 101.

[69] See R. Duval, *La littérature syriaque*, p. 260.

of those translations which had been brought to Spain by the Arabs, there had crept some treatises of Theodore of Mopsuestia,[70] or other prominent Nestorians, the perusal of which probably made an impression upon the Christians of the peninsula. We have already noted that Adoptianism had well-read and determined followers at Cordova.

The efforts made by Elipandus and Felix naturally met with opposition. Their first opponents were Beatus, abbot of Libana in the Asturias, and Heterius, bishop of Osma. As was to be expected, the Adoptianists represent these two men in no attractive light. We do not know in what way they first attacked the doctrine of Elipandus. It was probably done in the shape of a letter addressed to him. This exasperated the fiery old man; he vented his anger in a letter to Fidelis,[71] dated October, 785. The Bishop and the Abbot who became cognizant of it, replied by a long memorandum, addressed to Elipandus, in which they strove to refute his views. This is the *Heterii et sancti Beati ad Elipandum epistula*,[72] of which the conclusion is no longer extant.

Meanwhile, as the controversy was raising some noise, the Pope intervened. There is still extant a forceful letter of Hadrian to the bishops of Spain, in which he denounces, among the errors that must be shunned, that of Elipandus and Ascaricus. This letter was probably written in the year 785.[73] It seems to have had but little effect. Charlemagne's intervention was more effective. Urgel lay in his dominions, and his dominions were disturbed by the new doctrine. In 792, he convened a council of German, Italian and Gallic bishops at Ratisbon. Although the acts of this

[70] Our readers know that, since the episode of the Three Chapters, the West had Latin translations of Theodore's treatises.

[71] *P. L.*, XCVI, 918, 919.

[72] *P. L.*, XCVI, 893–1030.

[73] *P. L.*, XCVIII, 374.

synod are lost, we know in substance, from various authors, what took place there.[74] Felix of Urgel had to appear; he was allowed to explain and defend his doctrine, which was condemned; he confessed his error and retracted it either before the Council or before the Pope, to whom he was sent. He was then permitted to go back to Gothia and even, perhaps, to reascend the see of Urgel.

This is the first act of the drama. The second begins with the doctrinal relapse of Felix, who, in order to escape Charlemagne's severe measures, took refuge among the Saracens, most likely with Elipandus. It was there that he received from Alcuin a letter filled with expressions of esteem and charity,[75] entreating him to resist no longer the authority of the Church and the Fathers. Alcuin's letter was useless. Felix had concerted matters with his friends, and two letters were sent, in 793, or at the beginning of 794, by Elipandus and the dissenting bishops of Spain,— one to Charlemagne, the other to the bishops of Gaul, Aquitaine and Austrasia,[76] asking that Felix be restored to his see and pleading the cause of Adoptianism. The decision of Ratisbon was, evidently, considered as non-existent.

The answer to these two letters was the Council of Frankfort on the Main (794). This council was attended by the Pope's legates, Paulinus of Aquileia, Peter of Milan, and a great number of bishops, priests, and learned monks.[77] Felix did not appear. When they were invited to give, in writing, their sentiments on the question of Adoptianism, the bishops were divided into two groups: those of Italy,

[74] EGINHARD, *Annales,* ad ann. 792 (*P. L.*, CIV, 441); ALCUIN, *Adv. Elip. libri quatuor,* I, 16; LEO III, in the Council of Rome in the year 798 (MANSI, XII, 1031, *ex actione secunda*).

[75] Alcuin's whole attitude in this controversy is in striking contrast with that of Elipandus; it is marked by elevation, courtesy and charity.

[76] *P. L.*, XCVI, 867–869; CI, 1321–1331.

[77] EGINHARD, *Annales,* ad ann. 794.

whose leader was Paulinus of Aquileia, and those of Gaul and Germany. The former drew up the *Libellus episcoporum Italiae contra Elipandum,*[78] which rejected Adoptianism and anathematized Felix and Elipandus, unless they recanted; however, the Pope's decision — whatever it might be — was to be supreme (13). The memorandum of the Frankish and German bishops is in the shape of a letter entitled *Synodica concilii ab episcopis Galliae et Germaniae ad praesules Hispaniae missa.*[79] It contained, likewise, a discussion of Adoptianism and the proofs produced in its behalf, and compared the new heresy to Nestorianism. The Spanish doctors, St. Ildefonsus, St. Eugene, and St. Julian of Toledo, who were appealed to by Elipandus and his friends, are treated very disrespectfully; they are pushed aside as unknown writers, who would have remained absolutely forgotten, had not heresy called attention to them. However, nothing was said of St. Isidore. The whole document ended with an exhortation to return to the true faith. The Council took the decision that was to be expected under the circumstances. Its condemnation of Adoptianism (*capitul.* I),[80] was confirmed by Pope Hadrian in a letter to the bishops of Spain,[81] two or three years later (796 or 797), by the Council of Frioul,[82] and by Pope Leo III in a council at Rome (799).[83]

At this juncture Leidradus made his appearance.[84] He

[78] Mansi, XIII, 873. In the *P. L.,* XCIX, 151, it has the title *Libellus sacrosyllabus contra Elipandum.*

[79] Mansi, XIII, 883; *P. L.,* CI, 1331.

[80] Mansi, XIII, 909.

[81] Mansi, XIII, 865–873.

[82] Mansi, XIII, 843, 844; *P. L.,* XCIX, 294, 295.

[83] Mansi, XIII, 1031, 1032.

[84] Between the years 794 and 799, the two treatises of Alcuin, *Adversus Felicis haeresim libellus ad abbates et monachos Gothiae missus* (*P. L.,* CI, 87–120), and *Contra Felicem Urgell. episcopum libri septem* (*ibid.,* 119–230), were published, as well as the treatise of Paulinus of

had been sent by Charlemagne to examine on the spot the case of the Adoptianists and to summon Felix to appear before another council. He met Felix and induced him to go to the King. The council — it was the fifth that studied the question — was held at Aix-la-Chapelle, in the fall of 799.[85] For several consecutive days,[86] and in presence of the King and the Council, Alcuin disputed against Felix and a priest whom the latter had brought along, and "who was worse than his master."[87] At last, Felix was overwhelmed by his opponent's erudition, and being moved also by divine grace, declared himself convinced of his error.[88] At Charles' request, he drew up, in the shape of a letter addressed to the clergy and faithful of Urgel, a retractation that is still extant,[89] and was placed under the charge of Leidradus, who was told to keep him at Lyons and watch over him. To all appearances he seemed to be sincere in his conversion, and his perseverance in the path of truth would have never been questioned, had not Agobard, the successor of Leidradus, found, after the death of Felix (813), a memorandum which he had composed and in which he withdrew his retracta-

Aquileia, *Contra Felicem Urgell. episc. libri tres* (*ibid.*, XCIX, 343–468). The last two refuted a (now lost) self-defense presented by Felix to Charlemagne. See the arguments that Paulinus and Alcuin opposed to the Adoptianists, in Bach, *op. cit.*, p. 121 and foll., 128 and foll.

[85] Although the acts are lost, we know from other sources what took place there.

[86] *B. Flacci Alcuini vita*, 7 (*P. L.*, C, 98).

[87] Alcuin, *Epist.* CXVII, col. 350, 351.

[88] *Ibid.*

[89] This is the *Confessio fidei Felicis* (Mansi, XIII, 1035–1040; *P. L.*, XCVI, 882–888). Felix made the following declaration: "Non alius Dei Filius et alius hominis filius, sed Deus et homo, unicus Dei Patris verus ac proprius Filius, non adoptione, non appellatione [seu] nuncupatione, sed in utraque natura, ut dictum est, unus Dei Patris, secundum apostolum, verus ac proprius Dei Filius credatur" (*P. L.*, XCVI, col. 884).

tion.[90] Agobard thought that this writing ought not to be left unanswered; so, in order to refute it, he wrote the *Liber adversus dogma Felicis Urgellensis,*[91] which still remains a very important source for the knowledge of Adoptianism.

The death of Felix of Urgel deprived the heresy of its strongest support. Elipandus continued his resistance, and neither the charitable advances of Alcuin nor his arguments could overcome the old man's obstinacy.[92] But soon he became isolated,— a general without an army. A mission of Leidradus, Nefridius, and St. Benedict of Aniane, to Spain, in 799, was successful beyond expectation, and as early as the following year (800) Alcuin was able to announce to Arno, bishop of Salzburg, the conversion of twenty thousand dissenters, clergy and laity.[93] With this Adoptianism came practically to an end.

However it did not disappear immediately from Spain, and found a few supporters as late as the middle of the 9th century.[94] But the vigor and determination with which it had been fought by Charles and his theologians had proved its death-blow.[95] It gradually died out.

[90] Agobard, *Lib. adv. dogma Felic.,* I, col. 33.

[91] *P. L.,* CIV, 29–70.

[92] See Alcuin's letter to Elipandus (*P. L.,* CI, 235–244); the answer of Elipandus (*ib.,* XCVI, 870–880), and Alcuin's treatise, *Contra epistulam sibi ab Elipando directam libri quatuor* (*ib.,* CI, 231–300).

[93] *Epist.* CVIII, col. 329.

[94] About the controversy between Paul Alvarus of Cordova (+ about 861) and Aurelius Flavius Iohannes, cf. Bach, *op. cit.,* p. 146 and foll.

[95] Throughout all these proceedings Charles showed that he held himself responsible for the preservation of orthodoxy and peace in the Church. He is "filius et defensor sanctae Dei Ecclesiae", and therefore: "Hanc igitur fidem orthodoxam . . . nos pro virium nostrarum portione ubique in omnibus servare et praedicare profitemur" (*Epist. VI, ad Elipand. et caeter. episc. Hispaniae, P. L.,* XCVIII, 899).

§ 4. The Sacraments.

If we except the speculative doctrines which current controversies obliged them to treat, it was principally and quite naturally the more practical questions of the sacraments and ecclesiastical discipline that engaged the attention of the writers now under review and their contemporaries. It will not be useless briefly to note here certain statements and decisions deserving of particular mention.

Speaking of baptism and the anointing with oil, Leidradus reproduces, *en passant,* a part of the definition of a sacrament given by St. Isidore: "Propter quod et sacramenta dicuntur, quia sub tegumento corporalium rerum virtus divina secretius salutem eorumdem sacramentorum operatur." [96]

Theodulphus and Leidradus have each left a treatise,[97] and Alcuin a letter,[98] explaining the ceremonies of Christian initiation. There is nothing particularly striking in the treatises of Theodulphus and Leidradus. Following St. Gregory, whom he quotes, Leidradus holds that one immersion suffices for the validity of baptism, and ascribes to the anointing with chrism and the imposition of the bishop's hand the coming of the Holy Ghost into the soul of the Christian who is confirmed.[99] Alcuin denies that one immersion suffices for baptism and questions the authenticity of St. Gregory's letter that was appealed to in support of the Spanish custom.[100] His description of the ceremonies

[96] *Liber de sacramento baptismi,* VII, col. 864.

[97] Theodulphus, *Liber de ordine baptismi* (col. 223). Leidradus, *Liber de sacramento baptismi* (col. 853).

[98] Rather two letters, the *Epistula* XC (*P. L.,* C, 287) and the booklet, *De baptismi caeremoniis epistula ad Oduinum* (*P. L.,* CI, 811–814), which is a literal reproduction of part of the *Epistula.*

[99] *Op. cit.,* VI, VII.

[100] *Epist.* XC, col. 289, 293; cf. *Epist.* CXIII, col. 342.

of Confirmation is also peculiar. After being baptized, the neophyte is anointed with chrism upon the head (*sacro chrismate caput perungitur*); then he communicates; and it is only after receiving Communion that the bishop lays his hand upon him, to give him the Holy Ghost: "Novissime per impositionem manus a summo sacerdote septiformis gratiae Spiritum accipit." [101] Alcuin ascribes the conferring of the Holy Ghost to the imposition of the hand; to the unction with chrism he attributes the conferring of the kingly and priestly dignity upon the Christian who is confirmed.

Alcuin and Leidradus reëcho St. Augustine's considerations on the Eucharist as the spiritual body of Jesus Christ, and the union of Jesus Christ with the faithful, in which the spiritual eating of the sacrament consists.[102] This does not mean that these authors were symbolists. Alcuin has left us some very explicit declarations on the subject of the eucharistic conversion. When recommending himself to the prayers of Paulinus of Aquileia, he asks him to pronounce his name at the Mass "eo tempore opportuno quo panem et vinum in substantiam corporis et sanguinis Christi consecraveris." [103]

We find in the works of Theodulphus definite prescriptions concerning the number of communions which the faithful must make every year. Those who are not excommunicated shall communicate every Sunday in Lent, and every day from Holy Thursday till Easter. Those who are excommunicated, shall receive only when allowed to do so.

[101] *Epist.* XC, col. 292. The practice may have been dictated by some theological scruple. Probably it did not seem right for the neophyte to receive the third Person of the Blessed Trinity before receiving the second.

[102] Alcuin, *Commentar. in Ioan.*, III, cap. XV, vers. 50 (col. 834); Leidradus, *Lib. de sacram. bapt.*, IX.

[103] *Epist.* XLI, col. 203; cf. XC, col. 289.

Besides, no one ought to receive *indifferenter, i.e.,* without requisite preparation, nor wait too long before approaching the holy table.[104]

We have already noted[105] the various changes that had taken place from the 5th to the 8th century in the administration of penance, both on account of new needs and under the influence of the penitentials that had been imported to the continent from England and Ireland. These changes were: a greater frequency of private penance; its repetition; administration of penance by ordinary priests; admission of the clergy to the penitential exercises. At the time when Charlemagne began to rule (771), all these transformations were accomplished facts, and it is precisely during the period from 750 to 825 that the oldest continental penitentials make their appearance.[106] We find all these changes put into practice in the writings of the authors whom we are now examining, and especially in the second capitulary of Theodulphus to his clergy.

Theodulphus expressly distinguishes public penance, which is imposed for public and scandalous crimes,[107] from private penance. In the former, "capitalia et mortalia crimina

[104] *Capitula ad presbyteros,* XLI, XLIV, col. 204, 205; cf. Paulin., *Liber exhortatorius,* XXXIII. A council of Tours, in the year 813, prescribes (canon 50) that laymen should receive at least three times a year (Mansi, XIV, 91). A council of Chalon-sur-Saône, in the same year (canon 47) prescribes that all, except great sinners, should communicate on Holy Thursday (Mansi, XIV, 103).

[105] Chapter IX, § 10.

[106] These are the penitentials of Bourgogne, Bobbio, the 2d penitential of Paris, those of St. Hubert, Fleury-sur-Oise, Merseburg, the *Sangallense simplex,* the *Valicellanum* I, the *Vindobonense.* Cf. the texts in Schmitz, *Die Bussbücher,* I, II. No penitential was declared obligatory; some were even regarded with disfavor. Cf. the council of Chalon-sur-Saône (813), canon 38 (Mansi, XIV, 101).

[107] Cf. the council of Arles, in the year 813, canon 26 (Mansi, XIV, col. 62).

deflenda sunt secundum canonum et sanctorum Patrum institutionem." This does not mean that those sins cannot be remitted by private penance, but they call for a complete change of life: " saeculari iactantia simul deposita, piae religionis confesso studio per vitae correctionem et iugi, imo perpetuo luctu se submittente." [108] An instance of public penance is that imposed on Heistulfus by Paulinus of Aquileia.[109] Heistulfus had killed his wife, who had been accused of adultery, on the word of one single witness. Paulinus gives him the choice between entering a monastery or performing at home the exercises of public penance, according to the canonical prescriptions. He tells him very plainly that this latter form of expiation will be far more rigorous than the former.

However, such cases are rare. According to Theodulphus, things generally take place in this way: The penitent kneels first before God, with the priest to whom he is about to confess. Then, he confesses " quidquid a iuventute recordari potest ex omnibus modis quae gessit " ; not only the evil deeds, but also the evil words and thoughts of which he is guilty. If his memory is defective, or shame holds him back, the priest questions him. The questions, as well as the penitent's examination, bear mainly on the eight capital sins, *gastrimargia, fornicatio, acedia sive tristitia, avaritia, vana gloria, invidia, ira, superbia.* There are ready-made examinations and ready-made lists of sins in the penitentials and in Alcuin's liturgical works.[110] But Theodulphus remarks

[108] Col. 211.

[109] *Epist. ad Heistulfum,* col. 181–186.

[110] *De psalmorum usu,* I, 3, col. 470, and especially 9, col. 498 and foll.; *Officia per ferias, Feria* II, col. 524 and foll. Moreover, Alcuin has left a letter to the brethren of the country of the Goths (*Epist.* CXII) concerning the duty of confessing to the priest, and not to God alone (cf. the council of Chalon-sur-Saône, A. D. 813, canon 33), and a brief instruction on confession addressed to the children of

that there are things concerning which the penitent must not be questioned, "quia multa vitia recitantur in paenitentiali quae non decet hominem scire," and because it is to be feared that curiosity will prompt the penitent to commit them. After the accusation is made, the penitent must promise to give up and atone for his past sins. Then the confessor imposes on him a penance in proportion to his sins and their circumstances, recites the seven penitential psalms together with the prayers of the sacramentary, and absolves him on the spot.[111]

This is for laymen, some of whom — as is evidently supposed by Theodulphus — are relapsed.[112] If a priest or a minister in sacred orders has committed adultery or some other grave public fault, the culprit must be degraded, and do public penance for at least fifteen years, according to his order and the nature of his sin. If the fault is secret and the culprit comes secretly to confess it, a secret penance will be imposed upon him. But, in that case, must he abstain from performing the functions of his office? Theodulphus leaves this to his discretion; personally, he does not deem it necessary, since the fault is not known: "Si occultum est, poterit occulte, in suo permanens gradu, agere paenitentiam." [113]

The ancient penitential discipline thus came to resemble more and more, even in exterior form, the discipline of to-day. However, before taking leave of this subject, we may observe that, in the epoch which we are now studying, *i.e.*, during Charlemagne's reign, continental churches already began to admit the Anglo-Saxon concept and practice of the compensation or redemption of some penances deter-

the school of St. Martin of Tours, *De confessione peccatorum ad pueros Sancti Martini* (*P. L.*, CI, 649).

[111] Col. 217–219; cf. *Capitula ad presbyteros*, XXXI, col. 201.

[112] Col. 211, 215.

[113] Col. 215, 216.

mined by the penitentials.[114] The *Valicellanum I* notes that, if one cannot fast, he may make up for seven weeks of fasting by an alms of twenty *sous,* if he is well to do; ten *sous,* if he is of mediocre condition; and three *sous,* if he is very poor. He adds this advice, which breathes the meekness of the Gospel: "Et hoc scitote, fratres, ut dum venerint ad vos servi vel ancille querentes penitentiam, non eos gravetis, neque cogatis tantum ieiunare quantum divites, quia servi vel ancille non sunt in sua potestate. Ideoque medietatem penitentie eis imponite." [115]

The capitulary of Theodulphus, where we find so many precious details regarding penance, contains similar details on the subject of extreme unction. As we have noted before, beginning with the 6th century, this sacrament is often mentioned.[116] The Council of Aix-la-Chapelle, in 801, reminds priests of their duty to anoint the sick with the sacred oils.[117] Theodulphus describes the ceremony.[118] First, penance is given to the sick person. Then, if his condition permits, he is carried to church, where he is laid on a haircloth covered with ashes. Three priests are present at the ceremony. Ashes are imposed in the shape of a cross on the forehead and chest of the invalid. Then the organs of the senses are anointed with oil.[119] On this point, Theodulphus observes, customs vary considerably: unctions are

[114] This was called *arrea, equivalent, substitution.* Cf. D. Gougaud, *Les chrétientés celtiques,* p. 276, 277.

[115] J. Schmitz, *Die Bussbücher,* I, p. 243.

[116] Cf. above, chapt. IX, § 11.

[117] Canon 21.

[118] Col. 220–222.

[119] Theodulphus speaks of psalms and an antiphon during the singing of which the unctions take place; but he does not mention the formula that accompanied the unction; he mentions only that used by the Greeks: "Ungo te in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti, ut oratio fidei salvet te, et alleviet te Dominus, et si in peccatis sis, remittantur tibi."

more or less numerous, according to the liking of individuals.[120] The holy Viaticum concludes the ceremony. Children must receive extreme unction as well as adults, for they too commit sin; it can be administered to a bishop by an ordinary priest.

As regards marriage, Charlemagne's epoch witnesses the enactment of various decisions that determine its canonical status and codify its impediments. These decisions chiefly concern discipline. From the viewpoint of dogma,— the only one that now concerns us,— the principle of absolute indissolubility, even in case of separation *a thoro* for adultery,— is confirmed by three important enactments. One is found in Theodulphus' second capitulary;[121] the other is from a council of Nantes at the beginning of the 9th century;[122] the third is given in the Xth canon of the Council of Frioul, held under Paulinus of Aquileia in 796 or 797.[123] Theodulphus and the councils mentioned declare that neither of the partners who have separated for adultery, can remarry. The text of *Matthew,* XIX, 9, which seems ambiguous, was raised as an objection. But the Council of Frioul had St. Jerome's commentaries carefully examined, and ascertained that the great Doctor referred the restriction *nisi ob fornicationem* only to the dismissal of the guilty wife. His authority sufficed to settle the question.

[120] The text of Theodulphus' writing is in a rather poor condition; the numbers that he gives do not correspond to his detailed exposition of each one of them.

[121] Col. 213.

[122] Canon 12 (Mansi, XVII, col. 169); cf. Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conc.,* III, 2, p. 1247.

[123] *P. L.,* XCIX, 299; Mansi, XIII, 849.

CONCLUSION

In the last chapter of the first volume of this History, I have attempted briefly to draw the doctrinal and theological balance of the Church on the eve of Arianism. Here I should like to summarize the progress accomplished during the five following centuries, which has been set forth in detail in the second and third volumes.

If we leave aside the questions of minor importance raised in the East by the image controversy, and in the West by the particular errors of Priscillian, Helvidius, Vigilantius and others, we notice that during this period, the Christian mind directed its efforts towards the clearing up of the fundamental dogmatic data that have God and the Trinity, Christ, man and grace for their object.

The Christian writers of the 4th century investigated the Trinitarian problem, which was still under discussion at the beginning of that period, and succeeded in settling it once for all. To the radical negation of Arius, who rejected the divine nature of the Logos, the Council of Nicæa and St. Athanasius opposed the full and absolute affirmation of the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father. The whole sequel of the controversy is but the history of the struggles through which this affirmation and its formula had to pass before it was able to overcome the repugnance of the timid and overprudent, and to eliminate the semi-affirmations and diluted formulas substituted by others. From the assertion of the divinity of the Logos there follows almost necessarily that of the divinity of the Holy Ghost. As early as 381, the whole substance of the Trinitarian dogma was defined.

Then a new problem presented itself: that of the relations of the divine and human elements in Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ is God; He is also man, and He is but one. These three truths, it is but just to say, were always realized by the Christian mind. But how is Jesus Christ one? How was this unity brought about? How can it be expressed in technical language, and how far can it be extended? These problems formed the subject-matter of the Christological controversies which extend from the 5th to the end of the 7th century, and reappear at the end of the 8th. Terminology plays a very important part therein, and it is precisely because the terminology is somewhat indefinite at the beginning that the dispute lasts for a long while. The Church settles the problem by a series of decisions that balance one another, as it were, and, whilst successively throwing aside radical solutions, maintains the official doctrine in a middle way that avoids extremes. First Apollinarianism is condemned; then, in their turn, the excessive views of the school of Antioch are condemned in the person of Nestorius. This last condemnation seems to favor Monophysitism, and Apollinarianism again makes its appearance; but the Council of Chalcedon reproves Eutyches, and Antioch is victorious. The Fifth General Council tones down that triumph and asserts the intimate agreement of the decisions of Chalcedon and Ephesus, of St. Cyril and St. Leo. Then politicians strive to push the Cyrillian reaction to an extreme. The Sixth General Council rejects Monothelitism, which was a moderate form of Monophysitism, whereas, at a later period, the Councils of Frankfort and Aix-la-Chapelle condemn Adoptianism, which is a moderate form of Nestorianism. The councils do not demonstrate nor explain the intimate agreement which they proclaim: they leave to professional theologians the task of showing its grounds and correctness.

These great Trinitarian and Christological debates were waged chiefly in the East; but it may be questioned whether the East, because of its great fondness for discussion, could have ever put a stop to them without the intervention of the West. As a matter of fact, it is the West which, both at Nicæa and Chalcedon, secures the victory for its terminology and imposes formulas which it had already held for quite a while.

In its turn, the Christian mind of the West is called upon to settle the problems of original sin and grace. Its practical temperament is more at ease in these problems, since they refer directly to man, his inner condition, and the direction of his life. To Pelagius' downright naturalism St. Augustine opposes a system which, while preserving the essential rights of nature, makes it depend as closely as possible on God. The Augustinian reaction seems to some minds altogether excessive, and Semi-Pelagianism raises and formulates, on behalf of human nature, a protest that is not useless. The objectionable features of Semi-Pelagianism are condemned; but, by refusing to sanction St. Augustine's extreme assertions, the Council of Orange proclaims that those assertions do not adequately represent the faith of the Church. Here again, it is by setting aside excessive solutions that the definition of Christian dogma is elaborated.

As has been said before, the solution of the Trinitarian, Christological, and anthropological problems is the most prominent feature of the whole period from the 5th to the 8th century. However, it is far from being the *only* doctrinal progress that we have to record during that epoch. Those who have carefully read the pages of these last two volumes, may have observed the considerable development which Christian doctrine attained through gradually progressive steps that were often obscure and hardly noticeable,

in almost all its various branches; the doctrinal and legislative power of the Church solemnly affirmed by the texts and celebration of councils; the Roman primacy set in full relief and brought into practice, especially since the time of St. Leo; the theory of the sacraments in general sketched, and the conditions of their validity defined, by St. Augustine; the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist affirmed in precise formulas, and the theory of the eucharistic *conversion* elaborated to such perfection that it lacks but the technical term of *transubstantiation;* the fruits and efficacy of the eucharistic sacrifice explained, especially during the 6th and 7th centuries; the important evolution of the penitential discipline,— an evolution which, whilst, contrary to what is said in some quarters, not making indeed that discipline the sacrament of Penance (for it has ever been sacramental) yet, by promoting the more frequent practice of private penance, brings the external form of that discipline nearer to our present concept and practice of Penance. Moreover, extreme unction emerges, as it were, from the twilight where it had remained during the first four centuries, and gradually appears on the surface of history as a customary rite of the Church. The absolute indissolubility of marriage is proclaimed with more firmness by the Latins, and its canonical requirements are gradually defined and codified. The doctrine of purgatory is first timidly formulated by St. Augustine and then more fully exposed by St. Gregory, whilst the veneration of the Blessed Virgin, the saints, and their relics expands, and the many practices that follow more or less directly from the great dogmas of our faith, penetrate more deeply into the Christian life. All this blooming of doctrine, intelligence, and piety explains why — even independently of the personal worth of the men who had a part therein — that period of Church history which we have just

surveyed, the age of the Fathers, has always been deemed one of the most fruitful in her existence, one of the most glorious to recall.

And yet, in the midst of all the discussions that give rise to new formulas, and of the dogmatic and disciplinary development that brings forth a new language and new conditions, the Church is conscious that she makes no innovations and remains faithful to the primitive teaching of which the deposit has been entrusted to her. Up to the 4th century she invoked the authority of Jesus Christ and the Apostles; beginning with the 5th, she appeals, besides, to "the authority of the Fathers"; but, in doing so, she has no thought whatever of invoking a different authority to be added to the first and separable from it: she merely sees in it but one and the same authority that expresses itself by new organs. That authority is her own authority, that of the teaching Church; and, as the Church has received the words of eternal life and continues the work of Jesus Christ here below, her teaching — as she well knows — cannot swerve from that of the Master or differ substantially from it, either by way of diminution or addition. It is this conviction which imparts to the words of Popes and Councils so much firmness in their decisions, guides them in the dogmatic explanations they sanction, and makes them bring to the most varied problems the constant care to remain linked with antiquity and to continue the ancient tradition. Tradition is the very soul of the Church, and, even humanly speaking, it would be wonderful indeed if, with her keen solicitude to abide by it, the Church should have ever departed from it.

St. Vincent of Lerins did not think that she had ever done so; and yet he claimed for Christian dogma the right to grow and progress; for he wrote the famous lines that we have analyzed elsewhere and that may serve as a fitting conclusion for this work:

"Christi vero Ecclesia, sedula et cauta depositorum apud se dogmatum custos, nihil in his unquam permutat, nihil minuit, nihil addit, non amputat necessaria, non apponit superflua, non amittit sua, non usurpat aliena: sed omni industria hoc unum studet, ut vetera fideliter sapienterque tractando, si qua sunt illa antiquitus informata et inchoata, accuret et poliat, si qua iam expressa et enucleata, consolidet, firmet, si qua iam confirmata et definita, custodiat" (Commonit., 23).

LIST OF WORKS QUOTED

To enable the reader to find more easily the texts of authors whose works take up several volumes of Migne's *Patrology,* we here give a list of the works from which those texts are taken, with the indication of the volumes in which they can be found. The commentaries on Scripture are mentioned first, and then the other writings in alphabetical order.

St. Cyril of Alexandria.

	P. G.
Glaphyra in Genesim	LXIX
Glaphyra in Exodum	LXIX
Glaphyra in Leviticum	LXIX
Expositio in Psalmos	LXIX
Commentarius in Isaiam	LXX
Commentarius in Oseam	LXXI
Commentarius in Ioelem	LXXI
Commentarius in Matthaeum	LXXII
Commentarius in Lucam	LXXII
Commentarius in Ioannis evangelium, libri I-VI	LXXIII
Commentarius in Ioannis evangelium, libri VII-XII	LXXIV
Explanatio in epistulam ad Romanos	LXXIV
Explanatio in epistulam II ad Corinthios	LXXIV
Explanatio in epistulam ad Hebraeos	LXXIV
Adversus anthropomorphitas	LXXVI
Adversus Nestorii blasphemias	LXXVI
Adversus synousiastas (fragmenta)	LXXVI
Apologeticus contra Theodoretum pro XII capitibus	LXXVI
Apologeticus pro XII capitibus adversus orientales episcopos	LXXVI
Contra Iulianum	LXXVI
De adoratione in spiritu et veritate	LXVIII
De incarnatione Unigeniti	LXXV

	P. G.
De recta fide ad reginas	LXXVI
De recta fide ad Theodosium imperatorem	LXXVI
De Trinitate dialogi VII	LXXV
Epistulae	LXXVII
Explicatio duodecim capitum Ephesi pronuntiata	LXXVI
Homiliae diversae	LXXVII
Homiliae paschales	LXXVII
Quod beata Maria sit Deipara	LXXVI
Quod sancta Virgo Deipara sit et non Christipara	LXXVI
Quod unus sit Christus	LXXV
Scholia de incarnatione Unigeniti	LXXV
Thesaurus de sancta et consubstantiali Trinitate	LXXV

Theodoret.

	P. G.
Quaestiones in Genesim	LXXX
Quaestiones in Exodum	LXXX
Quaestiones in Leviticum	LXXX
Quaestiones in Numeros	LXXX
Interpretatio in Psalmos	LXXX
Explanatio in Canticum canticorum	LXXXI
Explanatio in Isaiam	LXXXI
Explanatio in Ezechielem	LXXXI
Explanatio in Danielem	LXXXI
Explanatio in Malachiam	LXXXI
Commentarius in epistulam ad Romanos	LXXXII
Commentarius in epistulam I ad Corinthios	LXXXII
Commentarius in epistulam II ad Corinthios	LXXXII
Commentarius in epistulam ad Galatas	LXXXII
Commentarius in epistulam ad Ephesios	LXXXII
Commentarius in epistulam ad Philippenses	LXXXII
Commentarius in epistulam ad Colossenses	LXXXII
Commentarius in epistulam I ad Timothaeum	LXXXII
Commentarius in epistulam ad Titum	LXXXII
Commentarius in epistulam ad Hebraeos	LXXXII
Criticism of the anathematisms of St. Cyril (in the latter's answer)	LXXVI

De incarnatione Domini (in the works of St. Cyril) LXXV
De Providentia LXXXIII
Epistulae LXXXIII
Eranistes LXXXIII
Graecarum affectionum curatio LXXXIII
Haereticarum fabularum compendium LXXXIII
Libellus contra Nestorium ad Sporacium LXXXIII
Pentalogium de incarnatione LXXXIV
Sermones et homiliae LXXXIV

St. Gregory the Great.

P. L.
Moralium in Iob libri I-XVI LXXV
Moralium in Iob libri XVII-XXXV LXXVI
In Ezechielem prophetam homiliarum libri duo LXXVI
Dialogorum libri quatuor LXXVII
Epistularum libri quatuordecim LXXVII
Homiliarum in evangelia libri duo LXXVI
Liber regulae pastoralis LXXVII

St. Isidore.

P. L.
De ecclesiasticis officiis LXXXIII
De fide catholica contra Iudaeos LXXXIII
De ordine creaturarum LXXXIII
Differentiarum libri duo LXXXIII
Epistulae LXXXIII
Etymologiarum libri XX LXXXII
Sententiarum libri tres LXXXIII

St. Bede.

P. L.
Hexaemeron XCI
Expositio in evangelium sancti Matthaei XCII
Expositio in evangelium sancti Marci XCII
Expositio in evangelium sancti Lucae XCII
Expositio in evangelium sancti Ioannis XCII
Expositio in epistulam sancti Iacobi XCIII
Expositio in epistulam I sancti Ioannis XCIII
Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum XCV
Homiliae XCIV

INDEX

INDEX

Absolution, among the Greeks, 243; the Latins during the 4th century, 376; the Latins during the 5th-8th centuries, 380, 381, 383, 384, 385, 391, 393, 394, 399; Theodulphus of Orleans, 527

Acacius of Constantinople. His schism and condemnation, 103, foll., 105

Acephali, a Monophysite party, 103, note, 104

Acoemetæ (Monks), 103, 126

Actistetæ, a Monophysite sect, 111

Adam. His primitive state, according to St. Cyril, 199; St. Maximus, 199; Theodoret, 199, 200; St. John Damascene, 477

Adoptianism, *Spanish*. Its origin, history, condemnation, 509, foll.

Æneas of Gaza. His treatise on the resurrection of the body, 260

Agatho, Pope St. His dogmatic letter, 174, foll.

Agnoetæ. Their origin, doctrine, condemnation, 121, foll.; 138, note

Agobard. His opposition to image worship, 465, note; refutes Felix of Urgel, 522

Alcuin. General characteristics, 498; writes to Felix of Urgel, 519; refutes him, 521; his teaching on the threefold immersion of baptism, confirmation and the Eucharist, 523, 524; his writings on the subject of penance, 526

Alexander of Hierapolis, a Nestorian, 43, note; 47

Anastasius of Antioch, a Monophysite, 156

Anastasius Sinaita. His teaching on the subject of God, 187, note; angels, 195, 197; the soul, 198; the primitive fall, 201; the Eucharist, 226; penance, 243, 244, 246, 248; the lot of children dying unbaptized, 262; everlasting punishment, 262

Anathematisms, St. Cyril's. Their tenor, 39; difficulties to which they give rise, 40; interpreted by St. Cyril, 41

Anatolius of Constantinople, 85, 89, 92

Andrew of Samosata, attacks St. Cyril's anathematisms, 41; joins Theodoret against him, 47

Angelogy of the Greek writers and especially Dionysius the Areopagite, 194, foll.; the Latin writers and especially St. Gregory, 328, foll.; St. John Damascene, 475-476

Anthimus of Constantinople, a Monophysite, 128

Anthropology of the Greeks, 198, foll.; the Latins, 332, foll.; St. John Damascene, 477-479

Aphthartodocetæ, Aphtharto-

DOCETISM. Origin and doctrine, 109, 110
ASTERIUS of Amasea. His testimony regarding the use of the cross and images, 426, 427
AUDIANS, heretics, practise public confession, 246, note
AUGUSTINE, St., is invited to the Council of Ephesus, 42; solves the difficulties of the monks of Hadrumetum, 264-265; answers Prosper and Hilary, 272. His testimony regarding private penance, 376. His remarks about the worship of pagan images, 429
AVITUS, St. His works, 310. His teaching on the subject of the *Filioque*, 325; the lot of children dying unbaptized, 335, note; private penance, 385

BABAI THE GREAT. His treatise *De unione* and teaching, 55, foll.
BAPTISM. Teaching of the Greeks, 224, foll.; the Latins, 358, foll.; St. John Damascene, 489-490; Leidradus and Alcuin, 523-524. Value of the baptism of heretics, according to the Greeks, 220-224; the Latins, 357, 359
BARSUMAS, bishop of Nisibis, organizes the Persian Nestorian Church, 52, 53
BASIL OF SELEUCIA. His works, 5, note. His teaching on the subject of angels, 195-196; Mary's sanctity, 256
BEATUS of Libana, opposes Adoptianism, 500, 518
BEDE, THE VENERABLE. General characteristics, 312; his teaching on the subject of philosophy, 322; angels, 329; Christ's human knowledge, 341; redemption, 344; the Church, 349; the Pope's primacy, 350; the efficacy of heretical baptism, 357; Christian baptism, 359; the real presence, 363; the eucharistic sacrifice, 372, 373; priests as confessors, 391; penance to be imposed by the confessor, 392; extreme unction, 401; the exception for adultery, 405, 406; Mary's sanctity, 409, note; retribution immediately after death, 413; purgatory, 414; the possibility of helping the souls in purgatory, 414; the last judgment, 419
BENEDICT, St. Influence of his order and of its rule on private penance, 386
BOETHIUS. His works, 307; his views on the subject of the procession of the Holy Ghost *a Filio*, 324; his questions concerning the Trinity, 326; his Christology, 337, foll.
BONIFACE II, POPE. Confirms the 2nd Council of Orange, 298
BONIFACE of Mayence, St. His statute as regards absolution, 393; extreme unction, 401; marriage impediments, 407, note

CÆSARIUS OF ARLES, St. General characteristics, 310. His teaching on the subject of grace and the 2d Council of Orange, 293, foll.; holds the Fathers in high esteem, 316; his teaching on the subject of the *Filioque*, 325; the sin of angels, 331; good works, 335; Redemption, 347; the frequency of communion, 370; the value of penance

performed *in extremis*, 381; private penance, 383, foll.; the necessity of penance, 395, note; the distinction of sins, 399, note; extreme unction, 400; the indissolubility of marriage, 406; the custom of having it blessed, 407; Mary's sanctity, 409; particular judgment, 413; purgatory, 413; hell, 415

CASSIAN. His works, 266. Exposition of his Semi-Pelagian doctrine, 266, foll.; he is attacked by St. Prosper, 274. His teaching on the subject of the senses of Scripture, 314; its interpretation, 315; the authority of the Church, 318; angels, 329, foll., and demons, 331; the creation of the soul, 332; Incarnation, 336; redemption, 343, 345; the frequency and effects of communion, 370, 371; the excellence of virginity, 412; retribution delayed till after the general judgment, 413

CASSIODORUS. Works and characteristics, 307. His teaching on the subject of the authority of tradition, 315; the Fathers, 316; God, 323; the soul and its spirituality, 332, 333; grace and its necessity, 333, 334; the call to faith, 334; the necessity of good works, 335; merit, 335; the notion of person, 338, note; Christ's human knowledge, 340; redemption, 344, 345; the Church and the duty to belong to it, 348; the real presence, 364; the eucharistic sacrifice, 372; extreme unction, 400; hell and everlasting punishment, 416; heaven, 417; the end of the world, 418

CEADDA, is reordained, 403

CELESTINE, POPE ST. Condemns Nestorius, 37, 38; his legates at the Council of Ephesus, 42; his letter to the bishops of Gaul, 273; his teaching on the subject of penance, 380

CELIBACY, ECCLESIASTICAL, in the Greek Church, 253, note; in the Latin Church, 402

CEREALIS of Castellum, 308, 324

CHILDREN, dying unbaptized. Their lot, according to Anastasius Sinaita, 262; the Semi-Pelagians, 271; Faustus, 285; St. Fulgentius, 292; St. Gregory, St. Isidore, St. Ildefonsus, St. Avitus, 334, 335

CHARLEMAGNE, introduces in France the singing of the creed with the addition *Filioque*, 503; foll.; has Adoptianism condemned, 518, foll.; opposes image worship and the 7th general Council, the *Libri carolini*, 458, foll.

CHRISTOLOGY of Diodore of Tarsus, 12 and foll.; Theodore of Mopsuestia, 13 and foll.; Nestorius, 21 and foll.; the later Nestorians, 53 and foll.; St. Cyril, 58 and foll.; Eutyches, 78, 79; St. Leo's letter to Flavian, 87–93; Theodoret, 94 and foll.; the Eutychian Monophysites, 107 and foll.; the Severians, 111; Leontius of Byzantium, 145 and foll.; St. Maximus, 180 and foll.; the Latins, 335, foll.; St. John Damascene, 479, foll.; the Adoptianists, 510, foll.

CHRODEGANG, ST., obliges his clergy to confess several times a year, 390. His revised rule

forbids masses that are strictly private, 373, note
Church. See Ecclesiology.
Circumincession in the Trinity, 189; in Jesus Christ, 181
Claude of Turin, an Iconoclast, 464, foll.
Columbanus, St. Influence of his order and his rule on private penance, 387-388
Communicatio idiomatum, ignored by Theodore of Mopsuestia, 19; Nestorius, 31; Babai, 56; lessened by Theodoret, 95; lost sight of by the Adoptianists, 514; defended by St. Cyril, 67; St. Leo, 82; St. John Damascene, 483; exaggerated by the Actistetæ, 111
Communion. On the subject of the dispositions for communion, its frequency and effects, teaching of St. Cyril, 230, foll., and the Greeks, 235; the Latins, 369, foll.; St. John Damascene, 492-493; Theodulphus, 524
Confession of sins. Teaching of the Greeks, 243. Practice of the Audians, 246, note; teaching of St. Leo, 378; St. Cæsarius, 383; Theodulphus, 526
Confirmation. Teaching and practice of the Greeks, 225; the Latins, 361, 362; St. John Damascene, 490; Alcuin, 524. Confirmation and its relations with the rite of the reconciliation of heretics, 223, foll.; 360, foll.
Constantine Copronymus, opposes holy images, 448, foll.; his other errors, 450
Constitutions of the Egyptian Church. What we learn from them on the subject of baptism, 224, note; confirmation, 225; the Eucharistic liturgy, 242; extreme unction, 250; ordinations, 252
Conversion, *Eucharistic*. Teaching of St. Cyril, 235, foll.; the Monophysites, 237; Theodoret, 237, foll.; Pseudo-Chrysostom, 240, 241; the Latins, 364, especially Gelasius, 365, foll.; Facundus, 367, note; St. John Damascene, 491; Alcuin, 524
Councils. Authority of general councils, according to St. Leo, St. Vincent of Lerins and St. Gregory, 318, 319; Council of Ephesus (431), 43 and foll.; Ephesus (latrocinium, 449), 83, 84; Chalcedon (451), 84 and foll.; Constantinople (553), 135 and foll.; the Lateran (649), 172; Constantinople (6th general, 680), 175 and foll.; Orange (529), 295; Hieria (Iconoclast, 753), 448; Nicæa (7th general, 787), 453, foll.; Frankfort (794), 459, 519; Frioul (796 or 797), 504, 508, 520; Aix-la-Chapelle (809), 505
Cross. Its use and veneration in the first centuries, 425-427; condemned by the Paulicians, 432, 438; approved by the 7th general Council, 454; St. John Damascene, 494
Cyril of Alexandria, St. General characteristics, 2-3. Works of the Saint quoted in this book, 536. His teaching on the subject of Holy Writ, 6; tradition, 7, 8; philosophy, 9; his struggle with Nestorius, 34 and foll.; his anathematisms, 39; his Christology, 58 and foll.; his teaching on the subject of

Christ's wills and operations, 72; Christ's human knowledge, 74; God, 185; the Trinity, 189; the procession of the Holy Ghost *a Filio*, 191 and foll.; angels, 195, foll.; man, 198; Adam's primitive state, 199; the fall and original sin, 199-200; grace, 204, foll.; redemption, 208 and foll.; the Church, 212, 213; the primacy of St. Peter and the Pope, 215, 216; baptism, 224, foll.; confirmation, 225; the Eucharist, 230, foll.; the eucharistic conversion, 235, 236; the eucharistic sacrifice, 242; the power of forgiving sins, 243; extreme unction, 251; marriage, 253; veneration of Mary and the saints, 255, 257; retribution immediately after death, 259; resurrection of the body, 260; the everlasting punishment of the reprobates and happiness of the just, 262

Cyrus of Alexandria, is won over to Monothelitism, 155; joins the Theodosian Monophysites, 155, 156; is condemned, 177, 178

Demons. Teaching of the Latins and especially Cassian, 331, 332; St. John Damascene, 476

De vocatione omnium gentium. Its doctrine, 281

Diodore of Tarsus. His Christology, 12 and foll.

Dionysius, Pseudo-Areopagite. General characteristics, 5; his philosophy, 9; his Christology, 128, note, 180, 181. His teaching on the subject of God, 185, foll.; angels, 195, foll.; the sacraments, 219; baptism, 224, 225; confirmation, 225; the real presence, 229, note; the eucharistic liturgy, 242; penance, 245, note; orders, 251

Dioscorus of Alexandria, restores Eutyches, 81; his rôle at the latrocinium of Ephesus, 83, 84; is deposed, 87

Dungal, a monk, refutes Claude of Turin, and allows some image worship, 465-466

Ecclesiology. Teaching of the Greeks, 212, foll.; the Latins, 348, foll.; St. John Damascene, 489

Ecthesis, The, of Heraclius, 163; accepted in the East, 164; condemned by the Popes, 173

Elipandus of Toledo. His history, error, condemnation, 510, foll.

Elect. Number of the elect: views of St. Prosper, 277; St. Leo, St. Gregory, St. Isidore, 334

Encyclical of Basiliscus, 101

Ephrem of Antioch, St., 129, 145, 241, note

Epiclesis. Its function in the eucharistic consecration, according to the Greeks, 229; the Latins, 367-369; Gelasius, 367; St. John Damascene, 492

Epiphanius, St. Did he really condemn holy pictures? 431, note

Eschatology of the Greeks, 259, foll.; the Latins, 412, foll.; St. John Damascene, 495

Eternity of the pains of hell, according to the Greeks, 262; the Latins, 416; St. John Damascene, 495. Confession of Lucidus, 283, note; definition

of the Council of Hieria, 450
Eucharist. Teaching of the Greeks, 226; foll.; the Latins, 362, foll.; St. John Damascene, 490, foll.; Alcuin, Leidradus, Theodulphus, 524, foll. Cf. also Presence (*Real*), Conversion (*Eucharistic*), Epiclesis, Sacrifice (*Eucharistic*), Communion
Eulogius of Alexandria writes against the Agnoetæ, 122; Monothelitism, 154
Eusebius of Cæsarea opposes holy pictures, 430
Eusebius of Dorylæa denounces Eutyches, 77; is deposed at the latrocinium of Ephesus, 84; appeals to the Pope, 84
Eutyches. His doctrine and his condemnation, 78 and foll.; 83, 87, 93
Eutychius of Constantinople. His testimony on the subject of the real presence, 227, foll.; the formula of consecration, 229; the eucharistic sacrifice, 242; anoints the sick with oil, 251
Evagrius Ponticus. His list of capital sins, 247
Extreme Unction. Testimony of the Greeks, 250; the Latins, 400-401; especially Theodulphus, 528

Facundus of Hermiana. His writings in support of the Three Chapters, 309; opposes their condemnation, 132. His teaching on the subject of the eucharistic conversion, 367
Fathers, The Holy. Use of the Fathers and teaching as regards the Fathers, in the Greek Church, 7-8; the Latin Church, 316-318. View of Leontius of Byzantium, 146; St. John Damascene, 470; Charlemagne's theologians, 497, 499, 515
Faustus of Riez. His Semi-Pelagian doctrine, 282, foll.; is declared an unapproved writer, by Hormisdas, 286; refuted by St. Fulgentius, 288. His teaching on the *Filioque*, 324; the corporeity of angels, 329, and of the soul, 332; the Eucharist, 363; the uselessness of penance *in extremis*, 380; penance performed in monasteries, 386, note; the necessity of good works for salvation, 415; hell and everlasting punishment, 416
Felix of Urgel. His errors, history, condemnation, retractation and death, 511, foll.
Felix IV, Pope, sends to St. Cæsarius a series of propositions against Semi-Pelagianism, 294
Ferrandus, Fulgentius, a deacon. His works, 308. He approves the formula of the Scythian monks, 127, note; rejects the Cyrillian formula, *Una natura*, 145, note. His teaching on the subject of the procession of the Holy Ghost *a Filio*, 324; redemption, 347; the Immaculate Conception, 409
Filioque. Cf. Holy Ghost.
Flavian of Constantinople condemns Eutyches, 77, foll.; is deposed at the latrocinium of Ephesus and appeals to the Pope, 84, foll.
Fortunatus. His testimony on image worship, 435
Fulgentius, St., approves the formulas of the Scythian monks, 126; his writings on the

subject of grace, and exposition of his teaching, 287, foll. General characteristics, 308. His teaching on the subject of the sources of faith, 313; the Church's inerrancy, 316; the doctrine of the *Filioque*, 324; the divine missions and the image of the Trinity engraved in us, 325, 326; angels, 329; demons, 331; the origin of the soul, 332; its spirituality, 333; the moment of the Incarnation, 337; the corruptibility of Christ's body, 339, 340; His human knowledge, 340; redemption, 343-346; the Church, 348, 349; the Roman primacy, 350; the duties of Christian rulers, 353; baptism, 358, 359; the real presence, 363; the words of consecration, 368; the necessity of communion, 370; the eucharistic sacrifice, 372; the classification of sins, 399, note; the Blessed Virgin, 408, 409; the preëminence of virginity, 412; the necessity of good works for salvation, 415; everlasting punishment, 416; the condition of the bodies of the just, 418-419

Φύσις. Meaning given to this word by St. Cyril, 58, 59; Severus of Antioch, 113-114

GELASIUS, POPE. His view on the subject of grace, 281, note; the eucharistic conversion, 365-367; the Church's supremacy in the spiritual order, 353, note. Teaching of the *Gelasian Decree* on the canon of Scripture, 313; the choice to be made among Church writers, 317; the Pope's primacy, 352, note

GENNADIUS of Marseilles. His works, 309. His Semi-Pelagianism, 286. His teaching on the subject of the *Filioque*, 324; the creation and corporeity of angels, 328, 329; the creation and corporeity of the soul, 332; Christ's personal unity and two natures, 337; martyrdom, 359; the value of heretical baptism, 359; the rite for the reconciliation of heretics, 360, note; the effects of communion, 371; private penance, 386, note; the veneration of the saints, 411; the excellence of virginity, 412; the universality of death, 413; retribution immediately after death, 413; the resurrection of the body, 418; the final renewal of the world, 419

GEORGE ARSAS, an Alexandrian Monophysite, 154

GERMANUS OF CONSTANTINOPLE, ST., refuses to condemn holy pictures, 442

GOD. Teaching of St. Cyril, 185; the Pseudo-Areopagite, 185 and foll.; St. Maximus, 187; Anastasius Sinaita, 187, note; the Latins, 323; St. John Damascene, 470

GRACE, *Actual*. Its necessity and mode of action: teaching of the Greeks, 204-207; Cassian, 266, foll.; generally the theologians of Provence, 269, foll.; St. Prosper, 272, foll.; the papal decisions, 279-280; the *De vocatione omnium gentium*, 281; Faustus, 282, foll.; the Scythian monks, 286; St. Fulgentius and the African bishops, 287, foll.; St. Cæsarius and the Council of Orange, 293, foll.; the

Latins, during the 6th and 7th centuries, 333, foll.; St. John Damascene, 478
Gregory of Nazianzus, St. His testimony on the use and veneration of images, 427, 428
Gregory the Great, St. General characteristics, 306; his teaching on the subject of Scripture, 313, 314; general councils, 319; the relations between reason and faith, 322; God, 323; the *Filioque*, 324; the divine missions, 325; angels, 328-331; the origin and spirituality of the soul, 332, 333; grace, predestination, the number of the elect, the lot of children dying unbaptized, 333, 334, 335; good works and merit, 335 Christ's human knowledge, 123, 340; redemption, 343-348; the Church, 348, 349; the Roman primacy, 350, 352; the repression of heresy, 353, 354; baptism, 358, 359; the rite for the reconciliation of heretics, 360; the minister of confirmation, 362; the real presence, 363; the conditions for communion, 371; the effects of the eucharistic sacrifice, 373; the penance to be imposed by the confessor, 392, 397; the effect of absolution, 394; capital sins, 399, note; the continence of subdeacons, 402; the indissolubility of marriage, 405; marriage impediments, 407; the Blessed Virgin, 408, 409; the veneration of saints and relics, 411; practices of piety, 411; retribution immediately after death, purgatory, hell, heaven, the resurrection of the body, the last judgment, 413-419; the use and veneration of images, 435-437
Gregory III, Pope, condemns Iconoclasm, 443

Hadrian, Pope, consents to the holding of the 7th general Council, 452; upholds, against Charlemagne, the teaching of that Council, 458-462; writes against Adoptianism, 518, 520
Heathen. Are they capable of performing morally good works? View of St. Prosper, 275; St. Fulgentius, 289; Theodoret, 204; Cassian, 267; Faustus, 285
Hell. Teaching of the Greeks, 262; the Latins, 415-416; St. John Damascene, 495
Henoticon, Zeno's; its doctrinal character, 102
Heraclius, the emperor, abets Monothelitism, 154 and foll.; publishes the *Ecthesis*, 163
Heterius of Osma, opposes Adoptianism, 518
Hinkmar of Rheims, condemns image worship, 466-467
Holy Ghost. The doctrine of His procession *a Filio*, denied by Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret, 190, 191; asserted in equivalent terms by St. Cyril, 191, foll.; the formula of later Greeks, 193, 194; asserted by Pope Martin I, 194, and the Latin theologians, 324, 325, except perhaps Rusticus, 324, note; teaching of St. John Damascene, 473, 474. The question discussed and defined against the Greeks, 507, foll. The *formula Filioque* introduced into

the symbol of Constantinople, 502, foll.

Honorius, Pope. His two letters to Sergius, 161 and foll.; he is upheld by John IV, 169; condemned by the 6th general Council, 177; Leo II, 178. His case and papal infallibility, 179, note

Hormisdas, Pope. His formula, 104-105. He concludes peace with the East, 105; his dealings with the Scythian monks, 125 and foll.; his answer à propos of Faustus of Riez, 286, foll.

Ibas. His letter to Maris, 52; is deposed at the latrocinium of Ephesus, 84; restored by the Council of Chalcedon, 88. His letter is condemned by Justinian, 130; by the 5th general Council and Vigilius, 137, 138

Iconoclasm. Its origin, history, condemnation, 421, foll.

Ildefonsus, St. His works, 311. His rules for making up the biblical canon, 313, note. His teaching on the subject of the procession of the Holy Ghost *a Filio*, 325; the origin of the soul, 332; the lot of children dying unbaptized, 335; the blessing of baptismal water, 356; baptism, 358-360; the value of heretical baptism, 359; confirmation, 361, 362; the Blessed Virgin, 408-410

Images. Their use and veneration in Christian antiquity. Image controversy in the East and in the West. Final decision, 421-467

Incorruptibility, *Christ's*. Views of the Aphthardocetæ, 109, 110; Severus of Antioch, 109; St. Fulgentius, 339-340; St. John Damascene, 484

Irenæus, Count, then bishop of Tyre, deposed by the Monophysites, 77

Isaac of Antioch. His testimony in behalf of extreme unction, 251

Isidore of Pelusium, St. His works, 5. His teaching on the subject of angels, 195; the primitive fall, 201; original sin in us, 202; the necessity of grace, 205; merit, 206; redemption, 208, 211; the dignity of the clergy, 213; St. Peter's primacy, 215; the value of the sacraments conferred by unworthy ministers, 219, 220; baptism, 225; the formula of consecration, 229; the effect of communion, 235; confession, 246, 247; satisfaction, 249, note; the effects of ordination, 252, note; relics, 257; the judgment and everlasting punishment, 261, 262

Isidore of Seville, St. General characteristics, 311. His teaching on God, 323; the procession of the Holy Ghost *a Filio*, 325; angels, 329-331; the human soul, 332, 333; grace, predestination, the number of the elect, the lot of children dying unbaptized, 333-335; Christ's human knowledge, 341; redemption, 344, 347, 348; the Church, 348, 349; rulers' duty to repress heresy, 353, 354; sacraments in general, 354-357; the value of heretical baptism, 359; the rite for the reconciliation of heretics, 360; confirmation, 361, 362; the real presence, 363; the function

of the epiclesis, 368; communion, 370; the eucharistic sacrifice, 372; the duty to do penance in danger of death, 395; penance imposed on higher clerics, 397; capital sins, 399; the hierarchy of minor orders, 401, 402; the sacramental character and indissolubility of marriage, 404, 406; the custom of having it blessed, 406; conjugal relations, 407; veneration of the saints, 411; retribution immediately after death, 413; purgatory, 414; hell, 415; heaven, 417; the condition of glorified bodies, 419; the last judgment, 419

Isoyahb I, a Nestorian catholicos. His symbol, 55; his canon regarding confession, 247, note

James Baradai, organizes the Jacobite Church, 106

John Askunages. His error on the subject of the Trinity, 187

John Climacus, St. His works, 6, note; his teaching on the subject of confession, 246; capital sins, 247; satisfaction, 248, 249; sacramental seal, 249; repetition of penance, 250; orders, 252

John Damascene, St. General characteristics, 468-469. His teaching on the subject of Scripture, tradition and philosophy, 469-470; God, 470; the Trinity, 470-473; the procession of the Holy Ghost, 473-474; creation, 475; angels, 475, 476; demons, 476; man, the fall, grace, predestination, 477-479; Christology, 479-487; Soteriology, 488-489; the Church, 489; baptism, 489-490; the Eucharist, real presence, the eucharistic conversion, the epiclesis, communion, 490-493; the eucharistic sacrifice, 493; Mariology and various devotions, 493-494; eschatology, 495-496. His teaching on the subject of images, 444-447. He is condemned by the Iconoclast Council of Hieria, 450

John of Antioch. His attitude towards Nestorius and St. Cyril, 38, 41, 43, foll.

John the Faster, patriarch of Constantinople. *Sermo ad paenitentes*, wrongly ascribed to him, 245, 247. His penitential, 247, note

John the Grammarian, an opponent of Severus of Antioch, 116

John Mandakuni. His testimony on the subject of the *ordo* of penance, 247, note; extreme unction, 251, note

John Philoponus. His error on the subject of the Trinity, 187

John II, Pope, approves the formula of the Scythian monks, 127

John IV, Pope, condemns Monothelitism and asserts Pope Honorius' orthodoxy, 169, 170

John of Thessalonica. His teaching on the subject of images, 433

Jonas of Orleans, refutes Claude of Turin; character of his treatise, 465, 466

Judgment, *General*. Teaching of the Greeks, 262, foll.; the Latins, 419, foll.; St. John Damascene, 495. Judgment, *Particular*. Teaching of St. Maximus, 259; St. Cæsarius, 413

JULIAN THE APOSTATE. His testimony regarding the use and veneration of the cross, 426
JULIAN of Halicarnassus, the founder of the Aphthardocetæ, 109
JULIAN POMERIUS, 293. His testimony on the subject of the procession of the Holy Ghost *a Filio*, 324, 325
JULIAN of TOLEDO, ST. His works, 311, 312; his Trinitarian formula, 326; Christology, 337, note. His teaching on the subject of Christ's human knowledge, 341; death and retribution immediately after death, 413; purgatory, 414; hell, 415, 416; heaven, 417; the resurrection of the body; 418; the last judgment, 419; the final renewal of the world, 419
JULIANISTS or GAIANITES, a name given to the Aphthardocetæ, 110
JUNILIUS. His testimony on the relations between reason and faith, 322
JUSTINIAN, first condemns, then upholds the Scythian monks, 125, foll.; condemns Origen, 129; condemns the Three Chapters and has them condemned, 130; espouses the cause of the Aphthardocetæ, 110
JUVENAL of Jerusalem, at Ephesus, 43; at the latrocinium of Ephesus, 83; is dispossessed, then restored, 101

KNOWLEDGE, *Christ's Human*. Views of Theodore of Mopsuestia, 14; St. Cyril, 74, foll.; Theodoret, 96; the Agnoetæ, 121, foll.; the Monophysites, 122; Eulogius, 122, 123; St. Gregory the Great, 123; Vigilius, 138, note; the Latins in general, 340, 341; St. John Damascene, 484; Felix of Urgel, 513, foll.

LEIDRADUS of Lyons. His dealings with Felix of Urgel; opposes Adoptianism, 520, 521. His teaching on the subject of the sacraments, baptism, confirmation, the Eucharist, 523, 524
LEO, ST. General characteristics, 305, 306. His teaching on tradition and the Fathers, 316, 320; councils, 318; the unchangeableness of dogma, 320; grace and the number of the elect, 279, 280, notes, 334; the Incarnation, his letter to Flavian, 81, foll.; confirms the council of Chalcedon, 92; his teaching on the subject of Soteriology, 341, foll., 346; the Roman primacy, 350, foll.; the repression of heresy, 353, 354; the efficacy and number of sacraments, 356, 357; the value of the sacraments administered by heretics, 359; the reconciliation of baptized heretics, 361; the real presence, 363; communion and its effects, 370, 371; penance, 378, foll.; priesthood, 401; chastity imposed on subdeacons, 402; reordinations, 402; the indissolubility of marriage, 405; the Blessed Virgin, 409; the veneration of the saints, 410-411; the end of the world, 418
LEO II, POPE, confirms the 6th general Council, 178

Leo III, Pope, approves the *doctrine* of the *Filioque*, but opposes the introduction of the *formula* into the creed, 505, 506; condemns Adoptianism, 520
Leontius of Byzantium. General characteristics, 4; his philosophy, 9, 146, foll.; his Christology, 149, foll.; his teaching on the subject of two operations in Christ, 150; the Eucharist, 235
Leontius of Neapolis. His defence of holy pictures, 434, 435
Liberatus, a deacon of Carthage, 309
Libri Carolini. Their origin and doctrine, 459-460
Licinianus of Carthage, upholds against Faustus the spirituality of angels, and of the human soul, 330, 333
Lucidus, a predestinatian, recants his error, 282, 283

Macarius of Antioch, a Monothelite, defends his views in the 6th general Council, where he is condemned, 176, 177
Macarius Magnes. How far he opposes holy pictures, 129
Mamertus, Claudian. His works, 310. His view on the subject of the corporeity of angels, 329; the spirituality of the soul, 333
Maraba, a Nestorian catholicos. His profession of faith, 55
Mariology of the Greeks, 255-257; the Latins, 408-410; St. John Damascene, 493-494
Marriage. Its character, indissolubility, impediments: teaching of the Greeks, 253-255; the Latins, 404-407
Martin of Braga, St. His works, 311. His view regarding one immersion in baptism, 358, note
Martin I, Pope, condemns Monothelitism, 172, 173; asserts the procession of the Holy Ghost *ex Filio*, 194
Maxentius finds fault with Pope Hormisdas, 126, 287, and condemns Faustus of Riez, 287
Maximus of Antioch, 88, 100
Maximus the Confessor, St. His works, 4; general characteristics, 180; his patristic compilation, 8; his philosophy, 9; his discussion with Pyrrhus, 171; his teaching on the subject of two wills, 182, foll.; God, 187; the Trinity, 189; the procession of the Holy Ghost, 194; the soul, 198; Adam's primitive state, 199; original fall, 200, 204; necessity of grace, 205; redemption, 208; the Church's inerrancy, 213; St. Peter's and the Pope's primacy, 215, 218; the particular judgment, 259; the transformation of risen bodies, 261; everlasting punishment, 262; the renewal of the material world, 262; image worship, 433
Maximus of Turin, St. His works, 306, 307. His teaching on the authority of Scripture, 314; Christ's personal unity and two natures, Christ's two wills, 337, 339; the Roman primacy, 350; the nature and efficacy of the sacraments, 356; baptism and martyrdom, 359; confirmation, 362; the frequency of communion, 370; the eucharistic sacrifice, 372; the Blessed Virgin, 408, 410; the veneration of the saints, 411; everlasting punishment, 416; the bliss of the

elect, 417; the resurrection of the body, 418; the final renewal of the world, 419
MEMNON, bishop of Ephesus, is present at the Council held in that city, 43; is deposed by the Orientals, 46
MENNAS of Constantinople, succeeds Anthimus, 129; receives Vigilius' *Iudicatum*, 132; sends to Vigilius a profession of faith, 135. His (apocryphal) letter to Vigilius, 155
MERIT. Teaching of the Greeks, 206, 207; the Latins, 335
MIGETIUS. His errors, 510, 511
MISSIONS, DIVINE. Explanation of St. Fulgentius and St. Gregory the Great, 325
MONACHISM, among the Greeks, 258-259; the Latins, 412
MONOPHYSITISM. Its true notion, 106. Its doctrinal evolution: Eutychian Monophysitism, 107, foll.; Severian Monophysitism, 111, foll.; St. Cyril, a Monophysite only in his expressions, 70, foll. The Monophysites reject images of Christ, 438
MONOTHELITISM. Its origin, 153 and foll.; its genuine doctrine, 164, foll.; history and vicissitudes, 169 and foll.; final condemnation, 173 and foll.

NARSES, the master of the school of Edessa and Nisibis, 52. His teaching on the subject of Christ's two hypostases, 53, 54; the function of the epiclesis in the eucharistic conversion, 229
NESTORIANISM. Exposition of Nestorianism, 21 and foll.; is condemned, 38, 44, 45. The Nestorian Church and teaching in Persia, 51 and foll.
NESTORIUS. His Christological teaching, 22 and foll.; his struggle against St. Cyril, 34 and foll.; is condemned by St. Celestine, 38, and the Council of Ephesus, 44, 45; his exile and death, 51; his testimony on the Eucharist as a sacrament, 226, and a sacrifice, 242
NICEPHORUS of Constantinople, condemns Iconoclasm, 455; 432, note, 455
NILUS, ST. His works, 5, note. His teaching on the subject of angels, 198; the primitive fall, 201; St. Peter's primacy, 215; baptism, 225; the real presence, 229; Christ's vivifying body in the Eucharist, 235; penance, 248, 249, 250; retribution immediately after death, 259; the resurrection of the body, 260, 261; judgment, 262; everlasting punishment, 262; the bliss of the just, 262; the use of images, 427

ORDINATION, ORDERS. Teaching and practice of the Greeks, 251-252; the Latins, 401-404. *Reordinations* among the Greeks, 220-224; the Latins, 402-404
ORIGENISM, condemned by Justinian, 129; by a synod of Constantinople, 130, and perhaps by the 5th general Council, 130, note, 141

PAUL II of Constantinople, a Monothelite, reproduces the doctrine of the *Ecthesis*, 171
PAUL of Emesa, 47, 48

PAULICIANS. Their opposition to the use and veneration of the cross and images, 438

PAULINUS II of Aquileia. His works, 500. He has the addition *Filioque* introduced into the symbol, 504, 508; condemns and refutes Adoptianism, 519, 520; imposes public penance on Heistulfus, 526; has the absolute indissolubility of marriage defined, 529

PELAGIUS, POPE, signs Vigilius' first *Constitutum,* 143; approves the 5th general Council, 143; asserts the validity of schismatical ordinations, 402–403

PENANCE. Teaching and practice of the Greek Church, 243-250; the Latin Church, 374-400; in the age of Charlemagne, 525-528

PENITENTIAL BOOKS. What they are, 387; how used, 387, foll.; 525, foll.

PETER THE FULLER, holds three times the see of Antioch, 100; what he adds to the *trisagion,* 100; condemns holy pictures, 438

PETER CHRYSOLOGUS, ST. His works, 306. His teaching on the subject of philosophy, 322; the sin of angels, 331, note; the Roman primacy, 350; Mary's perpetual virginity, 408; her rôle as coredeemer, 410; the superiority of celibacy, 412; the resurrection of the body, 418

PETER MONGUS, a Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria, 101, 102, 103

PHILOSOPHY. Regarding philosophy, sentiments of Theodoret, St. Cyril, St. Maximus, Leontius of Byzantium, 8, 146; the Pseudo-Areopagite, 9; Boethius, Claudian Mamertus, St. Prosper, St. Peter Chrysologus, Bede, 321-322; St. John Damascene, 469-470; Alcuin, 499

PHILOXENUS of Mabboug, 108, note, 120, note; his teaching on the subject of the moment of the animation of Christ's body, 115, note; the eucharistic conversion, 237; images, 438; how he understood the *trisagion,* 100

PRÆDESTINATUS, PREDESTINATIANISM, 282-284

PREDESTINATION. Views of Cassian, 268; generally the theologians of Provence, 270; St. Prosper, 274, 278; the Predestinatians, 282; Faustus, 285; St. Fulgentius, 290, foll.; St. Gregory and St. Isidore, 334; St. John Damascene, 478-479

PRESENCE, REAL. Teaching of the Greeks, 226-228; the Latins, 362-364; St. John Damascene, 490-491; Alcuin and Leidradus, 524

PRIMACY of St. Peter and of the Pope. Teaching of the Greeks, 215-219; the Latins, 350-353; Theodore Studita, 456; St. John Damascene, 489

PROCLUS of Constantinople, opposes Nestorius, 22. His works, 6, note. His testimony on the subject of the primitive fall, 201; original sin, 202; redemption, 211

PROGRESS OF DOGMA. Theory of St. Vincent of Lerins, 320-321, 534

PROSPER, ST., writes to St. Augustine, 269; his writings on the subject of grace and refutation

of Semi-Pelagianism, 272, foll.; his teaching on the subject of the authority of Scripture, 314; the knowledge of God, 323; the *Filioque*, 324; angels and demons, 330, 332; Christ's personal unity and two natures, 336; the spontaneity of Christ's sacrifice, 345, 346; the Church, 348, 349; the final renewal of the world, 419

Πρόσωπον. Meaning given at times to that word in the *Book of Heraclides*, 27, foll.

Prudentius. His testimony on the subject of the adoration of the cross, 427, and the use of images, 427

Purgatory. Teaching of the Greeks, 259-260; the Latins, 413-414

Pyrrhus of Constantinople, a Monothelite. His dispute with Maximus, 171; is condemned, 177, 178

Quicunque vult (Symbol). Its origin and date, 327-328. It contains the doctrine of the *Filioque*, 325

Rabbulas, bishop of Edessa, upholds John of Antioch, then St. Cyril, 51

Relics. Teaching and practice of the Greeks, 257; the Latins, 410-411; Copronymus, 450; Claude of Turin, 465; St. John Damascene, 494

Resurrection of the body. Teaching of the Greeks, 260-261; the Latins, 418-419; St. John Damascene, 495

Rusticus, a deacon. His reserve on the subject of the doctrine of the *Filioque*, 324, note; his teaching on the veneration of the cross, 432

Sacramentals, in the Greek Church, 258; the Latin Church, 411

Sacraments in general: their notion, composition, mode of action, number, efficacy, the value of sacraments administered by heretics: teaching of the Greeks, 219-224; the Latins, 354-357; Leidradus, 523

Sacrifice *of the Cross*, according to St. Cyril and the Greek theologians, 210-212; the Latin theologians, 344-346; St. John Damascene, 488. *Eucharistic* Sacrifice. Teaching of the Greeks, 226, 241-242; the Latins, 372-374; St. John Damascene, 493

Saints, Veneration of the, in the Greek Church, 257; the Latin Church, 410-411; opposed by Copronymus, 450 and Claude of Turin, 465

Salvian. His works, 309. His teaching on the subject of God, 323; the necessity of good works, 335; the real presence, 363; marriage, 404; heaven, 417

Satisfaction, in the Greek Church, 248, 249; the Latin Church, 375, foll.; the continental churches, in the age of Charlemagne and his immediate successors, 525, foll.

Scripture, Holy. Teaching of St. Cyril and Theodoret, 6; the Latins, canon, inspiration, interpretation, 313, foll.; doctrinal value, 314; teaching of St. John Damascene, 469

Scythian, Monks. Their formula and its history. 124, foll.; their opposition to Faustus and teaching on the subject of grace, 286, foll.

Semi-Pelagianism. Its origin, history, condemnation, 264, foll.

Sergius of Constantinople. His efforts to obtain the triumph of Monothelitism, 154, foll.; his letter to Honorius, 159, foll.; prepares the text of the *Ecthesis*, 163. His genuine teaching, 167, foll.; is condemned, 175, 177, 178

Sergius the Grammarian, an Eutychian, 115

Severus of Antioch, 104; his Christological teaching, 111, foll.; his teaching on the subject of the corruptibility of Christ's body, 109; the formula for the consecration of the Eucharist, 229; the eucharistic conversion, 237; holy images, 438

Simeon Stylites the Younger, St. His testimony on image worship, 433

Sin, Original. Teaching of Sabrisio, 55, note; the Greeks, 201-204; Faustus, 282; St. Fulgentius, 289; the Council of Orange, 295; St. John Damascene, 477-478. Sins, Actual. Their classification in the Greek Church, 247; St. Cæsarius, 383, 399, note; St. Fulgentius, St. Gregory and St. Isidore, 399, note; Theodulphus, 526

Smaragdus, an abbot. His works, 499; writes in support of the *Filioque*, 505

Sophronius of Jerusalem, St. His works, 4; opposes Monothelitism, 157, foll.; his instalment letter, 157

Soteriology of the Greeks, 207 and foll.; the Latins, 341-348; St. John Damascene, 488-489

Soul. Definition given by St. Maximus, Anastasius Sinaita, 198; St. Isidore, 332, note; Cassiodorus, 333, note; St. John Damascene, 477. Its spirituality: teaching of Faustus, Gennadius, Claudian Mamertus, Licinianus, St. Fulgentius, Cassiodorus, St. Gregory, St. Isidore, 332-333. Its creation: views of the Greeks, 198; the Latins, 332; St. John Damascene, 477. The time of its union to the body: views of Severus and Philoxenus, 114, note; St. Maximus, 198

Statuta Ecclesiæ antiqua. What they say on the subject of the Church, 349; penance, 380, 393, 395; orders, 401-402

Stephen Niobe, an ultra-Monophysite, 111

Stephen III, Pope, condemns Iconoclasm, 451

Tarasius of Constantinople, upholds image worship, 452; presides over the 7th general Council, 453

Θεοτόκος, accepted with qualification, by Theodore of Mopsuestia, 19; Nestorius, 32; Theodoret, 95; defended by St. Cyril, 69; Cassian, 336

Tetraditæ, heretics who admit in God a quaternity, 188, 189

Theodore, Pope, condemns the *Ecthesis*, 171; deposes Paul II of Constantinople, 171

THEODORE ASKIDAS, an Origenist, 129; induces Justinian to condemn the Three Chapters, 130, 133; condemned by Vigilius, 135; makes his submission, 135

THEODORE OF CANTERBURY. His penitential and private penance, 387. His teaching on the subject of reordinations, 403; the dissolubility of marriage, 405

THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA. His Christology, 13 and foll.; is condemned by Justinian, 130, 134, and the 5th general Council, 137

THEODORE OF PHARAN, a Monothelite, 155; is condemned, 173, 177, 178

THEODORE STUDITA, St., a defender and martyr of image worship, 455, 456

THEODORET. General characteristics, 3. His teaching on the subject of Scripture, 6; the Fathers, 8; philosophy, 8, 9. His opposition to St. Cyril, 41, 44, 46, 47, 50. He is persecuted, then deposed by the Monophysites, 77, 84; restored by the Council of Chalcedon, 84, 88. His Christological teaching, 94 and foll.; his teaching on the subject of the Trinity, 189; the procession of the Holy Ghost, 190; angels, 194 and foll,; the creation of the soul, 198; Adam's primitive state, 199; original fall and sin, 200, 201; the necessity of grace, 204, 205; good works and merit, 207; redemption, 208, 211; the Church, 212; the clergy, 213; the primacy of St. Peter and the Pope, 215-216; confirmation, 225; the real presence, 226, 237; the epiclesis, 229; communion, 237; his eucharistic dyophysitism, 240; his teaching on the Eucharist as a sacrifice, 241, 242; penance, 243; ordination, 252; the indissolubility of marriage, 253; second wedding, 254; veneration of angels, 257; relics, 257; retribution immediately after death, 259; the resurrection of the body, 260; everlasting punishment, 262; the felicity of the just, 262; the final renewal of the world, 262. His testimony on the veneration of the cross, 426-427; and of images of St. Simeon Stylites, 428

THEODOTUS of Ancyra. His works, 5, note. His testimony on the subject of the original fall, 200-201

THEODULPHUS of Orleans. His works and characteristics, 499-500; his treatise on the Holy Ghost, 505; his teaching on the subject of baptism, 523; communion, 524-525; penance, 525-528; extreme unction, 528-529; the indissolubility of marriage, 529

THOMAS of Edessa, a Nestorian. His treatise, De nativitate *D. N. Christi,* 55

THREE CHAPTERS, The. What they are, 130, note. History of their condemnation, 130 and foll.

TIMOTHY ÆLURUS, a Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria, 100, 101. His Christology, 120, note

TIMOTHY SALOFACIOLUS, an orthodox patriarch of Alexandria, 101, 102

TRADITION. The argument of tradition, among the Greeks, 7; the

Latins, 315; St. John Damascene, 469
Trinity. Error of John Askunages and John Philoponus, 187; Damian, 188; teaching of the Greeks, 189; the Latins, 323-328; St. John Damascene, 470-474
Trisagion. Addition made by Peter the Fuller, 100, 101
Tritheitæ, the name given to the disciples of John Philoponus, 188
Typus, The, an edict of Constans II, 172; is condemned by Martin I, 173

Ὑπόστασις. Meaning given to that word by Theodore of Mopsuestia, 17; Nestorius, 23; the later Nestorians, 54; St. Cyril, 58; the Council of Chalcedon, 91; Leontius of Byzantium, 149. How translated by Boethius, 338, note

Victor of Cartenna. His teaching on the subject of the repetition of penance, 389
Vigilius, Pope, 131; his conduct in the affair of the Three Chapters, 131 and foll. Letters wrongly ascribed to him, 131, note, 139, note
Vigilius of Tapsus. His works, 308; cf. also 340, 358
Vincent of Lerins, St., attacks St. Augustine's doctrine, 273. His works, 309. His teaching on the subject of the sources of faith, 313; the interpretation of Scripture, 315; tradition, 315; the authority of the Fathers, 317-318; that of general councils, 318-319; the *canon* of Lerins, 319 and foll.; his teaching on the progress of dogma, 320–321, 534; Christ's personal unity and two natures, 336

Walafrid Strabo. His teaching on image worship, 466
Will of God to save men. Teaching of Cassian, 268, and generally the theologians of Provence, 270, 271; St. Prosper, 277-278; the *De vocatione omnium gentium*, 281; the Predestinatians, 282, 283; Faustus, 283, 285; St. Fulgentius, 291, 292; St. John Damascene, 479
Works, *Good*. Their necessity for salvation, teaching of the Greeks, 206; the Latins, 335
Xystus III, Pope, strives to restore peace between Cyrillians and Orientals, 47

3139

234.233.3
T18
v.3

History of dogmas /
J. Tixeront

3139

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY
BERKELEY, CA 94709